DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 743 EC 061 848

AUTHOR	Bernal, Ernest M., Jr.; Reyna, Josephine
TITLE	Analysis of Giftedness in Mexican American Children and Design of a Prototype Identification Instrument.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office for Gifted and Talented.
PUB DATE	Mar 74
CONTRACT	OEC-4-7-062113-307
NOTE	93p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Ability Identification; *Behavior Rating Scales; Community Attitudes; Cultural Factors; Disadvantaged Youth; *Exceptional Child Research; *Gifted; Kindergarten; *Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Primary Grades; Surveys; Talent Identification; Test Construction

ABSTRACT

Cultural community based definitions of giftedness were obtained in survey interviews with 300 Mexican Americans in three Texas cities and incorporated into a behavior rating scale and an adjectival scale (for parents) to identify the gifted and talented among 108 bilingual Mexican American children in kindergarten-grade 3. The children were nominated by teachers and administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children; the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, Verbal and Figural Form A; and the De Avila Cartoon Conservation Scales. Fifty-four children were rated on the behavior and adjectival scales by parents. Thirty-four children were judged gifted according to results on at least one of the five tests. Parentally rated scales were available for 22 of the 34 gifted students. Some of the results from interviews revealed that Mexican Americans believe giftedness requires verve and style as well as intelligence; and that the gifted display traits such as using imagination freely, being more active and aware, and associating more with adults. Multivariate discriminate analysis of the 43-item behavioral rating scale indicated significant differentiation between the gifted and nongifted groups. Individual items on the behavior rating and adjectival scales also discriminated between the two groups. (Included are original and revised versions of the behavior rating scale and the adjectival scales, a summary of techniques for identifying gifted minority children, and the community survey in English and Spanish.) (MC)

ED 090743

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Analysis of Giftedness in Mexican American Children and Design of a Prototype Identification Instrument

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Austin, Texas

EC 061848

ED 090743

Analysis of Giftedness in Mexican American Children and Design of a Prototype Identification Instrument

by

Ernest M. Bernal, Jr.
and
Josephine Reyna

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Final report submitted to the Office of Gifted and Talented, U. S. Office of Education, and to the National Institute of Education. The research reported herein was conducted pursuant to Contract OEC-4-7-062113-307. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and should in no way be construed as reflecting the views or positions of the U. S. Office of Education or the National Institute of Education.

March 1974

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Tx 78701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Giftedness, Creativity, Talent: A Review 10

Methodology 16

Results 32

- Community perspectives 32
- Analyses of the data 38
- Behavior ratings 40
- Adjective ratings 45
- Discussion of the basic analyses 48

Conclusion 50

- Behavior Rating Scale 53
- Adjectival Scale 54

Summary of Techniques for Identifying Gifted Minority Children 55

Appendix A: Community Survey: English 62

Appendix B: Community Survey: Spanish 70

Appendix C: Original Behavior Rating Scale 79

Appendix D: Original Adjectival Rating Scale 82

References 84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Gifted Child Cutoff Scores Established by Jury Raters on Five Test Instruments 25

Table 2: Number of Gifted Children Identified by Jury Raters on Five Test Instruments 26

Table 3: Number of Gifted Children Identified by Each Jury Rater and Median Jury Rating 28

Table 4: Correlations Between Jury Raters and Group Median 29

Table 5: Rounded Mean Numbers of Gifted Children Identified by Jury Raters on Five Test Instruments 30

Table 6: Numbers of Different Children Identified as Gifted on at Least One Test 31

Table 7: Behavioral Items Which Best Discriminate Between Gifted and Normal Groups on the Discriminant Function 41

Table 8: Behavioral Items Which Best Discriminate Between Gifted and Normal Groups on Univariate Analysis 43

Table 9: Mean Behavior Ratings for Gifted and Normal Children on Discriminating Items 44

Table 10: Adjectival Items Which Best Discriminate Between Gifted and Normal Groups on Univariate Analysis 46

Table 11: Mean Adjective Ratings for Gifted and Non-gifted Children on Discriminating Items 47

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years much programmatic emphasis has been placed on meeting the educational needs of the financially and educationally disadvantaged student and the student from a culturally or linguistically different background. These programs must be maintained; indeed even more energies need to be invested in them. But in providing educational programs and related services for these children, we have too frequently overlooked the special needs of the gifted and talented child. Despite popular opinion to the contrary, intellectual and creative talent cannot survive educational neglect and apathy (Gallagher, in press). It is time for us to realize that it is in our best interest to assure not only the development of children who have the potential to make extraordinary contributions to our society in general but also to the emergence of our non-dominant ethnic groups.

Exceptionally talented individuals come from all races, socioeconomic groups, geographic areas, and environments. A conservative estimate of the gifted population ranges between 1.5 and 2.5 million children out of the total school population of 51.6 million (1970 estimate). In Education of the Gifted and Talented (1972), the U. S. Office of Education acknowledges "a widespread neglect of gifted and talented children." This neglect is even more intense among the minority groups, particularly with Mexican American children and the children of other Spanish-speaking groups, whose giftedness may be unnoticed and unnurtured in schools lacking the capability even to identify the gifted among them. Three of the major findings of the U. S. Office of Education study serve to reiterate these facts:

- Existing services to the gifted and talented do not reach large and significant subpopulations (e.g., minorities and disadvantaged) and serve only a very small percentage of the gifted and talented population generally.

- Special services designed for the gifted and talented disadvantaged will also serve other target populations singled out for attention and support.

- Services provided to gifted and talented children can and do produce significant and measurable outcomes.

The gifted and talented among the Mexican American minority group pose a particular challenge and opportunity for educators. The fact that some unusually gifted Mexican Americans have emerged and demonstrated outstanding ability does not diminish the need for educational planners and researchers to attend to the special problems of their early identification and nurture within the schools. For each gifted Mexican American who has overcome the obstacles and discouragement posed by educational neglect and has demonstrated his or her ability, how many other bright Mexican Americans have been frustrated by the lack of opportunity for development and have given up or expressed themselves in socially unacceptable ways? (See Dodd, 1964)

To discover and develop the potential of the gifted youngsters in the minority groups necessitates comprehensive planning. Evidence from various studies and reviews (e.g., Bruch, 1972; De Hann & Havighurst, 1961; Freehill, 1961; Stallings, 1972) suggests that the more specific and carefully planned the intervention, and the earlier the intervention, the better the results. Unfortunately, extant measures of giftedness are not particularly reliable or valid indices when used on young children (Blosser, 1963). Attempts to utilize tests at the preschool level have been successful only when careful preliminary screening and search have been conducted (Baldwin, 1964; Martinson, 1960; & Walton, 1961).

The problem of developing talent continues to be one of devising educational opportunities that will unlock this creative and intellectual potential,

programs that will be concerned with values, attitudes, self-concepts, and commitment to continued growth, not just the acquisition of knowledge.

> A more humanistic education, where the affective is integrated with the cognitive has special meaning for our gifted youngsters--as it does for all youngsters. We need to allow the development of a gifted child's capacity for love, empathy, awareness and his ability to communicate as a human being with his fellow human beings. (Lyon, 1972).

While we are trying to bring together the cognitive and affective in a total educational approach for all children, we must remember that before programs for the gifted minority group children can be designed, the gifted among them need to be identified and their special needs studied. At the time of school entry and continuing throughout their school career the gifted and talented present challenging educational problems because of their unusual intellectual abilities.

Minority children who are gifted need to be recognized for a number of reasons:*

1. They are more difficult to identify than members of the dominant ethnic group because tests and measures used to identify dominant group students are not valid cross-culturally.

2. A greater number of minority group gifted students are alienated by their educational experiences in a non-responsive educational system than are gifted students of the dominant ethnic group. This is manifest in the high drop-out rates of the minority group.

3. Intervention strategies in general and educational programs in particular require a more comprehensive sensitizing of instructional personnel to deal not only with the high potentials of these youngsters but also with the different style of life through which they exhibit these propensities.

*Three members of the project staff presented these needs at the 1973 Northwest Regional Conference on the Gifted and Talented in New Haven, Connecticut.

For example, we need to develop methodologies for bilingual-bicultural education. The natural strength of the dominant language of minority group members--be it language difference from English or a dialectical variation of English--must be capitalized upon in the instruction of the child. Furthermore, the mother tongue must be given status in the school program as a means of expressing itself worthy of retention and elaboration, in order to preserve a child's ethnic identification while providing him linguistic alternatives with which to cope with the dominant society.

4. If programs for the gifted members of non-dominant ethnic groups are to avoid the criticisms leveled against many compensatory programs, they must provide for the leadership of ethnically-targeted projects by members of the ethnic groups themselves.

   We submit that the identification and cultivation of the most gifted and talented members of the diverse ethnic groups would greatly facilitate the self-management of ethnic destiny.

   The visibility of minority leadership would greatly enhance the culture as a whole and the self-concept of the individual child.

The gifted child is especially alert to the irrelevancy of his schooling and may become even more frustrated than the average child. In an unresponsive system, what special efforts can we expect for the education of the gifted? We need an ethnically compatible educational system which will provide for individual differences in children, one that will do the following:

1. Develop early identification techniques.

2. Individualize instruction in a manner relevant ethnically to ethnically compatible school systems.

3. Promote cultural and linguistic pluralism through the deliberate cultivation of the best young minds in the community, so that children in contact across cultures can benefit from the strengths in the other cultures.

4. Develop and implement a system of inservice for teachers, counselors, administrators and paraprofessionals which will make them sensitive and responsive to the needs of youngsters and enable them to use and adapt relevant curriculum.

5. Recruit, train and retain minority group members in positions of power in education and other fields of creative endeavor.

In The Gifted Child in the Elementary School, James J. Gallagher (1959) discusses the usefulness and limitations of the various procedures for identifying gifted children, none of them flawless. Using only teacher observation we would miss underachievers, the culturally different, children with motivitational problems, children with emotional problems, and children with a belligerent or apathetic attitude toward the school programs. Also, in the U. S. Office of Education study, it was discovered that teachers do not identify about 50 percent of the gifted, and tend to include other students within the gifted category merely because they are well-dressed, polite and obedient. Barbe (1964) found that teachers do not nominate 25 percent of the highly gifted. Similar levels of inaccuracy appear to occur when attempts were made to select the creative child (Martinson & Seagoe, 1967). Informal methods of nomination definitely need supplementing with standardized tests of intelligence and achievement or with other, valid assessment techniques.

According to Gallagher (1959), individual intelligence tests are the best method, but expensive in the use of professional time and services. It is not practical as a general screening tool in schools with limited psychological services. Of late, much criticism has been raised concerning the use of intelligence tests, based on middle-class knowledge and values, with minority group children (DeAvila, 1972).

Gallagher (1959) considers group intelligence tests to be generally good for screening, but these measures may not identify those potentially gifted students with reading difficulties, emotional or motivational problems, or what he calls cultural impoverishment. Education of the Gifted and Talented (U. S. Office of Education, 1972) reports that the more highly gifted are actually penalized by group intelligence tests. Achievement test batteries will not identify the underachieving child who is nonetheless exceptionally

bright. Achievement tests are typically constructed to measure breadth of knowledge--not depth of understanding, not comprehensive knowledge, nor knowledge transferable across situations. Creativity tests, Gallagher feels, do show promise of identifying the divergent thinker who may be overlooked on the intelligence tests, but may be too narrow in scope to be used without being supplemented by other measures.

The tests presently used to identify gifted and talented youngsters are biased in favor of the population for which they were devised (Bernal, 1971, 1972a). It would seem, furthermore, that the greater the loading of these tests on g, general intelligence, the greater the likelihood of bias against non-dominant ethnic groups (Kleinfeld, 1973). They tend to measure the extent to which an individual's background is similar to that of the model cultural configuration of American society. Rarely has a test of intellectual potential been written for and standardized on a group of minority children. Test publishers and psychometrists have failed to fully consider the cultural and linguistic differences of minority group children when constructing, publishing, and administering these tests or interpreting their results.

An analysis of the content and format of items used in many of the traditional I.Q. tests suggests that many of these tests are measuring something other than that for which they were designed--at least when applied to children who are not of the same cultural background. For these persons, the tests are also measures of socialization and language (Zirkel, 1972), productivity or level of aspiration, experience or specific learning, and endurance. Psychometricians fail to take into consideration some of the differences between middle class Anglos and most minority groups: (1) minority group children as a rule do not speak or understand the language of the test; (2) they have not had the opportunities to acquire the knowledge (experience

of specific learning) necessary to pass the tests; (3) their experiences have not predisposed them to testing situations and have not developed test-taking strategies; and (4) they have a different cultural background, but are penalized by the socialization aspects of the I.Q. tests for not having acculturated (Mercer, 1971; Bernal, 1972a; DeAvila, 1972).

Not only are many of the identification measures methodologically controversial and controvertible, but (as will be seen in a subsequent chapter of this paper) the experts even have difficulty agreeing on a test-based definition of giftedness. This lack of a concise consensual definition (ORI, 1971) has often been a stumbling block to research on giftedness. The leaders in the field, however, are becoming increasingly aware that identification procedures that screen or bar participation of minority students in programs for the gifted have to be reconsidered (Gallagher, in press). Rather, the procedure should stress a search for talent. The question should not be whether minority students obtain a certain high score on tests of intelligence or achievement or creativity, which are appropriate with Anglo populations, but whether there are indications--perhaps taken from real life and reflecting the marks of intelligence fostered by their respective ethnic communities--of their true potential for cognitive development and the acquisition of functional bicultural skills. If talent potential is to be identified, better strategies must be found for accommodating test related linguistic and cultural differences between ethnic groups in general and their differential readiness to take tests (Bernal, 1971) and exposure to test content in particular. Also, professionals are beginning to understand that "intelligence" can be defined differently from culture to culture (e.g., Kleinfeld, 1972)--a matter of great moment to Mexican Americans who must live in two cultural settings.

Passow (1972) wrote that

> Giftedness and talent always have a social referent--those abilities that are identified and developed are those that are valued by society--and the child in the depressed area who is potentially gifted may be doubly disadvantaged for he lives in an environment that may be hostile or apathetic to his particular abilities. (p. 28)

Undoubtedly, a cross-cultural study of giftedness would serve to clarify the concept, much as other cross-cultural studies shed light on other traits or attributes (Manaster & Havighurst, 1972).

Knowing that there is no generally agreed upon definition of giftedness, that the present methods of identification are inadequate, in some respect, for all gifted children but especially for the minority gifted, and that giftedness as a construct or idea must always have some referents--i.e., is defined in a social context (Vernon, 1969)--the Bilingual Early Elementary Program of SEDL proposed to approach the study of giftedness as perceived by Mexican Americans themselves. The necessity of involving the Mexican American community--parents, community leaders, students, and children--is evident when we recall Passow's statement "...those abilities that are identified and developed are those that are valued by society." Studies done by psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and historians have shown that Mexican Americans have some unique social and cultural values (e.g., Ramirez, 1972; Romano, 1969). It follows that Mexican Americans would also have some distinct behaviors which are valued by the Mexican American community and therefore selectively reinforced and developed.

An interview format was developed to elicit people's perceptions about gifted and talented children as well as examples of behaviors which would, in their eyes, be indicative of the trait. The interview and responses are

discussed later in the report. A review of the interview responses led to the development of a behavioral check list, which became the basis for the study described herein.

Although this report presents the result of an exploratory study--a first attempt to develop an instrument to identify gifted Mexican Americans who would not ordinarily be identified with traditional techniques--this research is a significant and encouraging step toward better identification methods and, ultimately, toward the design of culturally responsive programs for the gifted child of divergent background. Whereas other studies have indicated that certain behavioral/personality traits are associated with potential giftedness, this research shows that some of these traits are indeed diagnostic (or differentially predictive) of this potentiality, much as Meeker (1971) believed they would be.

GIFTEDNESS, CREATIVITY, TALENT: A REVIEW

An extensive review of the literature has produced a number of definitions of giftedness, creativity and talent. Many of the definitions overlap, since they refer to correlated constructs or are derived from similar sources in the literature. Unfortunately the terms are often used without being defined, which leads to confusion. In the introduction of the ORI (1971) study on the needs of the gifted and talented, it is clearly stated, "there is no set of widely used, standard definitional criteria by which gifted and talented students can be identified."

The traditional definition of giftedness has been a "high" score on an individual intelligence test, which means that "giftedness" was reduced to a type of cut-off score indicating those children who would be predicted to make good marks in their school work generally. As other measures of identification were developed or came into vogue (e.g., teacher nomination, high achievement test scores), they were used to supplement the judgments made on the basis of I.Q. alone. These measures, used singly or in combination, have been most typically used as screening devices. A second method of describing gifted children lists characteristics or abilities, such as learning to read earlier and with greater comprehension of nuances in the language, learning basic skills in all subject areas faster and with less practice, delving into some interest beyond their age level, assuming responsibilities ordinarily associated with the behavior of older children, communicating with unusually mature clarity in one or more areas of talent (whether verbal, numerical, artistic, or affective), assuming leadership roles, and exhibiting earlier social maturity, advanced moral judgment, or less peer conforming behavior.

Defining gifted children by characteristics has led to an expansion of the traditional definition. Another factor which aided in this expansion was the realization that other abilities valued by this society, such as adaptiveness, creativity, and originality were not being assessed by the measures of memory, standard vocabulary, and simple problem-solving commonly found in the I. Q. tests.

One important result of the ORI (1971) study was the compilation of a definition of giftedness, the one now used by the Office of the Gifted and Talented, U. S. Office of Education.

> Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who by virtue of outstanding abilities are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society.
>
> Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination:
>
> 1. general intellectual ability
> 2. specific academic aptitude
> 3. creative or productive thinking
> 4. leadership ability
> 5. visual and performing arts
> 6. psychomotor ability
>
> It can be assumed that utilization of these criteria for identification of the gifted and talented will encompass a minimum of 3 to 5 percent of the school population. Evidence of gifted and talented abilities may be determined by a multiplicity of ways. These procedures should include objective measures and professional evaluation measures which are essential components of identification.
>
> Professionally qualified persons include such individuals as teachers, administrators, school psychologists, musicians, and others with special training who are also qualified to appraise pupils' special competencies.

Although creative thinking is listed among the possible abilities or attributes of the gifted, it is beneficial to define creativity, especially since the term is popularly overused. The controversy between intelligence and creativity has not been totally resolved, since studies indicate widely differing relationships between creativity and intellectual aptitude. Through Guilford's studies with his model of intelligence, the Structure of Intellect, a number of tests have been designed to measure divergent thinking abilities, which are generally considered to require greater creativity than convergent thinking abilities (Guilford, 1972). These tests are used to determine creativity in children. Components of particular importance to creativity are sensitivity to problems, word fluency, ideational fluency, association fluency, expressional fluency and spontaneous fluency and originality (Guilford, 1965).

Torrance (1966) defines creativity as the natural human process which occurs when a person becomes aware of a problem or an informational gap. He begins to form ideas or hypotheses, then proceeds to test and revise them and finally, communicates the results.

An emphasis has been placed on the usefulness or social value of the activities. The production of the creative idea is not sufficient to be termed "true creativeness." This must involve following through on the original idea or insight, that is, evaluating and then developing it fully. Others define creativity in terms of personality: (1) an openness to experience--where the meaning of a stimulus is extended beyond its immediate connotations, (2) the ability to evaluate internally, rather than by reference to existing external events, and (3) the ability to "toy with elements and

concepts," to juggle elements into impossible juxtapositions and make them stick.

Giftedness, especially intellectual prowess, is most often defined as a cut-off point on an individual intelligence test. In his Genetic Studies of Genius, Terman used 140 I.Q. Most recent researchers have used 130, partly because of the somewhat larger number of students which this figure yields and partly because the group selected is more stable statistically. Gowan (1971) proposes a definition which is more operational in scope, and which is founded on differential behavior. A gifted child is one who has the "potential to develop creativity." Giftedness, he states, is potentiality, a rate of mental development, while creativity results in a product. Creativity is behavioral and "can be seen and measured in action."

Gowan believes that this distinction means that the cut-off point for giftedness could be brought down to 120, the point below which creativity and intelligence are highly correlated, and above which there doesn't exist much correlation (Getzels and Jackson, 1962; Torrance, 1962). By defining a gifted child as one who has the potential to develop creativity, Gowan has shown the ultimate dependence of great intellectual ability on the creative process.

Although Gowan's definition of giftedness is innovative, in that it links giftedness and creativity, it still uses the I.Q. score as the basic criterion for selection. Others, notably Bruch (1970, 1971) and Torrance (1969), have proposed some selection criteria outside the realm of traditional screening processes. Even though their emphasis and research is with the Black disadvantaged gifted, many of their procedural suggestions can be used by all concerned for the identification and development of gifted children from other

ethnic groups for whom I.Q. tests and similar measures are of questionable validity or low educational utility.

Bruch (1972) suggests that standardized tests and other screening procedures are applicable for the purpose of identification only to the extent of the similarity between the individual Black student's economic and cultural background and that of the normative group. Stallings (1972) uses a technique which questions students about their own environs to supplement traditional testing measures in identifying gifted children.

Within the minority groups, the identification of gifted people, particularly gifted children, cannot be limited to a high score on an I.Q. test. The assessment procedure must include measures which will indicate potential for further, more rapid development. Before designing these instruments, researchers in the field of giftedness must discover the group's values, definition of talent, and productive goals. They should also determine the kinds of abilities which would need strengthening for the minority gifted to be able to function well in the world at large. Therefore, the criteria for identification should be specific to the values of giftedness and talent held by the minority group and should also include ethnically appropriate, predictively valid measures of mainstream competencies; it seems likely, however, that some of the ethnically based measures would also be predictive of bicultural success.

As Bruch and Torrance summarized the lists of special abilities of Black disadvantaged gifted children, they found clusters around the general concept of creativity. That is, these children appear to "learn well creatively, to be innovators and initiators and problem solvers in their own culture "(Bruch, 1972). Researchers and educators are just beginning to consider such abilities for identification of gifted children.

Educators of the gifted are moving away from using any one criterion for identification. Some factors which should be taken into consideration when identifying disadvantaged gifted are personal and family information, personality factors and the attitude of teachers and school administrators.

Talented behavior is differentiated from overall giftedness by an emphasis on singularity or circumscription of achievement. Stalling (1972) defines talented children as those who demonstrate a single talent in one specialized area. McGuire (1961) emphasizes that talented behavior be both personally and socially significant. The ability, whether natural or acquired, should be recognizable through performance (academic or artistic) or products (scientifically or artistically creative) by peers and professionally qualified persons.

Gowan* makes another distinction: Gifted students have high potential for verbal creativity, whereas talented students have a high potential for non-verbal creativity.

*From notes taken during J. C. Gowan's address, "The Gifted Child Today and Tomorrow," at the TAG-Connecicut State Department of Education's Conference, Action Programs for the Gifted, Talented, and Creative Child, New Haven, November 9-10, 1972.

METHODOLOGY

Cross-cultural literature survey. A cross cultural search of the literature as it related to the gifted child was undertaken. A number of different sources were tapped: journals, books, abstracts, the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) system, and works not yet published. The search of the literature from the Spanish-speaking countries, pertaining to giftedness, the development of mental tests, and the development of a culturally based definition of giftedness was conducted at the Latin American Collection of the University of Texas at Austin.

Two facts became very clear as a result of the literature survey. First, the Spanish-speaking countries have not developed a culturally based definition of giftedness, nor have they developed their own mental tests. Rather, they are using translations or adaptations of verbal or non-verbal tests of intelligence and creativity developed in the United States. (These include the Prueba de Inteligencia de Wechsler, the Goodenough Draw-A-Man, the Stanford-Binet, and the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking.)

Secondly, the majority of the literature on giftedness in the United States is based on psychologists' or educators' ideas of giftdness, which are still tied to a score on an intelligence test. Furthermore, no works were found which attempt to discover what the popular ideas of giftedness or talent are in the United States or to document the value of these traits in American society. After extensive discussion, the project staff concluded that the manifestations of giftedness in these definitions would be largely limited to fields requiring high verbal or scientific abilities, scholarship in particular. Likewise, talent would most likely be seen in traditional art forms or compositions. There is, then, the possibility that the larger

American society--including the dominant Anglo ethnic group--would view and attribute these qualities somewhat differently than educators or psychologists do, perhaps by extending the domains of giftedness and talent.

Community input. This project was postulated on the belief that a community, in this case, the Mexican Americans of Texas, can speak to the matter of intelligence. We affirm the necessity and validity of involving the community in a behavioral study. Chicanos do recognize and articulate many traits, attributes, characteristics, and capabilities of the truly outstanding thinker and performer. In an interview situation they are able to describe particular behaviors which are culturally valuable and, therefore, useful in distinguishing the gifted and talented child from the average.

Project field specialists worked with Mexican American barrio communities in three Texas cities to determine how giftedness and talent are perceived. An interview questionnaire in English (Appendix A) and Spanish (Appendix B) was developed by the project staff to gather data on such factors as the personal characteristics of gifted or talented children; how giftedness is revealed in the school, home, and community; the relationship of giftedness to bilingualism; and what kind of environment or background best allows giftedness in a child to flourish.

The interviewer introduced himself and gave a short statement of the purpose of the interview. "...I'm working on a study of the Mexican American culture with the Southwest Lab about talented and gifted children. We all know that everybody is different from everybody else in some ways. We are especially interested in the very talented and very gifted Mexican American child."

The interview format presented two sets of similar questions, the first set directed to the talented and the second to the gifted. Before the actual

questioning began, a story of a talented or gifted child was told, and some examples were given of talented or gifted people in our culture. By using the story and examples, we hoped to focus the respondents' attention on talent or giftedness while biasing their responses as little as possible.

The questions were designed to elicit a variety of responses. The first few questions were to elicit traits and characteristics useful in defining talent or giftedness in Mexican Americans. The next set of questions was to elicit behavioral statements useful in designing the behavior checklist.

The next two questions were intended to educe an image of a talented child. "Do you think of this child as being male or female, Mexican American or Anglo? If Mexican American: does (he/she) have light or dark skin?" Although some people were offended by this question, it was intended to discover if Mexican Americans associate giftedness with looking like an Anglo or a Spaniard (having light skin).

Question six was also misinterpreted by a few people. By asking, "In what areas do you think Mexican Americans are especially talented?" the staff wanted to assess in which areas Mexican Americans felt other Mexican Americans were especially talented and which areas were valued enough to be mentioned.

Question seven required that the interviewee think of persons in her/his acquaintance. Names given of children, five to eight years old, were recorded. Some of these children were visited at school or at home at a later date.

Three hundred interviews were conducted during a three-month period in the barrios of San Antonio, Austin, and Dallas. Of the respondents interviewed, 12.7% had little or no schooling. In the Southwest as a whole, 17.6% of the Mexican American population have little or no schooling. Thirty-seven percent (37%) of the interviewees had completed primary but had not completed high school, compared to the Southwest as a whole, where

46.42% have acquired the same level of schooling. Forty-two percent (42%) of the respondents had completed high school and some college, while only 35 percent of the Mexican Americans in the Southwest have. This higher than average educational level probably reflects the fact that most of the interviews were conducted in university towns (Austin and San Antonio) by university students. Six percent (6%) of the interviewees had eitner completed college, were in graduate school, or were professionals. This percentage is reflective of the Southwest as a whole (4.8%).

The interviews were read and tabulated by the project staff. This was done by hand, since the staff agreed that to tabulate with the computer would have required categories of responses which might not have been valid. As staff members worked with the data, categories of responses emerged naturally. Contradictory statements also were sorted by category, and if as many as 25 percent of the statements in any category were confounded, it was removed as a possible descriptor. The remaining categories were used in two ways. The first was to develop a limited cultural definition (see Community Perspectives) of giftedness in Mexican American children, fully realizing that this was a first attempt at exploring community points of view and that a definition will emerge as further research--principally in other geographic areas--is conducted. The items in these categories became the raw material for the development of the behavioral and adjectival checklists. The interview was structured to elicit statements of behaviors or actions which were thought to differentiate between average and gifted children.

Developing the behaviors rating scale and adjective rating scale. One hundred and twenty-six (126) of these behavioral statements were put on cards for ease in sorting. Twenty (20) Mexican Americans, 15 of which were

professionals, were asked to sort the statements into seven groups: Gifted, Talented, Average, Gifted and Talented, Talented and Average, Gifted and Average, and Irrelevant/Undecided. The judges then ranked the statements within each of the categories (except for the categories of Average and Irrelevant) according to their probable ability to discriminate among Gifted, Talented, and Average children. The behaviors were then tabulated according to their frequency in each category and by their mean rank within categories. These tabulations were inspected visually, and items which appeared in about equal frequency across the categories were eliminated, as were those which were consistently low in rank or found in the Irrelevant/Undecided Category over 25 percent of the time. Based on the results of this sorting procedure, the number of basic behavioral statements was reduced to 43.

These behavior statements were then cast into scale form. The lead-in question is, "How frequently does (name of S) do (the particular behavior)?" or "How frequently do (these behaviors) happen with/to (name of S)?"

The adjectival rating scale was developed from the categories by extracting the single word descriptors most often used. Polar adjectives were used at the other end of a seven point scale.

Both the behavioral and the adjectival items were revised according to the suggestions of the independent judges before they were written into the rating form administered to the parents of the children in the sample. The behavioral statements and the adjective check list constituted the basic interview for parents.

The sample. Bloom (1964) and Martinson (1961) have shown that early identification of gifted children is best for the child, since it permits the schools to nurture these children's gifts from the outset of their

educational experiences. For this reason the sample population was limited to bilingual Mexican American children in grades K-3, roughly five to eight years old.

In the interest of time and in the hope of generating a greater proportion of gifted youngsters for the purpose of this exploratory study than would normally be found in any population, the project staff decided to rely on the assistance of the staff and facilities of the Creative Learning Center in the Dallas area and on the Teacher Corps volunteers in the Edgewood Independent School District, San Antonio, for nominations. The Creative Learning Center gathers together some of the brightest, most creative minority group (Mexican American, Black, American Indian) and Anglo children in Dallas. The Teacher Corps volunteers were in the classroom four mornings a week. They were also involved in the community, made home visits, and set up clinics for such things as filing Income Tax Returns.

The Teacher Corps volunteers who worked with the project staff underwent two brief training sessions, one to dispel stereotypes about giftedness and the other on how to conduct the interviews themselves. The volunteers were working at Loma Park Elementary (income ranging from very poor to lower middle class) and Guerra Elementary (mostly migrant). They were asked to turn in six names of students in their respective classrooms, two gifted, two average, and two below average. They were also asked to try to obtain spontaneous validation of their nominations from the neighbors and parents of the children themselves on the interview forms.

A total of 108 bilingual children were nominated and tested. Although some children were nominated from Austin, test conditions proved to be

unfavorable. Each child was administered the WISC, Torrance-Thinking Creatively with Words, Verbal and Figural (Form A) and the DeAvila Cartoon Conservation Scales. All tests were administered within a three-month period. The field specialists contacted the parents of the sample group and administered the behavior scale and adjective scale. The field specialists conducted these sessions in the homes. Often it was impossible to find the parents at home or able to devote their full attention to responding. Therefore, of the 108 Mexican American children tested, 54 were actually rated by their parents, yielding a usable sample of the same number. There were 35 males and 19 females in the sample.

The test instruments. The Cartoon Conservation Scales (CCS) were developed based on the theory that the determination of intelligence must be studied through the examination of intra-individual rather than inter-individual approaches. Several measures of Piaget's conservation tasks were assessed by this cartoon format developed by DeAvila, et al. In DeAvila's (1972) procedure, three cartoon frames were presented in which two children discuss a Piagetian task. In the first frame an equality is established between two objects according to the dimension being studied (i.e., number, length, substance, etc.). In the second frame an identity transformation is depicted, and in the third frame the question of conservation of equivalence is asked. On the right side of the panel three possible answers are presented. The correct and the two distractor choices, which show the characters responding to the question, are randomly ordered in order to avoid position effects. In its current form the CCS consists of 30 cartoon panels. There were six items for each of the five tasks--conservation of number, substance, length, weight, and ego. While Piagetian development has not been used in the past as a measure of giftedness, the psychometric advantage of using the CCS, a test standardized on Chicano populations, and the possibility of considering

advanced cognitive sophistication as a mark of giftedness warranted its use.

The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking consists of two batteries, Verbal Form A (or B) and Figural A (or B). Form A in Spanish and English was used in this study. The Verbal Tests consist of seven parallel tasks. Each task is believed to bring into play somewhat different mental processes, yet each requires the subject to think in divergent directions. The activities involve asking questions about a drawing, making guesses about the causes of the pictured event, making guesses about the possible consequences of the event, producing ideas for improving a toy so that it will be more fun for children to play with, thinking of unusual uses of cardboard boxes, asking provocative questions, and thinking of the varied possible ramifications of an improbable event. The Figural Tests include three activities. The first task, Picture Construction, is designed to stimulate originality and elaboration. The two succeeding tasks, Incomplete Figures and Repeated Figures, increasingly elicit greater variability in fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration (Torrance, 1966). Very importantly, the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking permit minority children to respond "correctly" in terms of their own experiences (Torrance, 1972), since diverse (and divergent) expression is the essence of each test.

The theory underlying the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) is that intelligence is an integral facet of personality and the two cannot be separated. In constructing this measure a deliberate attempt was made to take into account some of the other factors which contribute to the intelligence of an individual. The WISC consists of twelve subtests in two major groupings, as follows--Verbal: Information, Comprehension, Arithmetic, Similarities, Vocabulary, and Digit Span; Performance: Picture Completion, Picture Arrangements, Block Design,

Object Assembly, Coding and Mazes. In this study, eight of the twelve tests were used (the first and last tests of the verbal and performance groups were not administered), and the verbal and performance I.Q.s were prorated from these scores. When necessary, the instructions for each subtest were given in Spanish.

The WISC was originally standardized on a sample of 2,200 boys and girls. There were 100 boys and 100 girls in each of the age groups, from five through fifteen years. Only Anglo children were used to standardize the WISC (Wechsler, 1949).

Selection of gifted group after data gathered. In selecting the initial sample for testing, the Teacher Corps Volunteers' nominations were relied upon. But test data were the basis upon which gifted and non-gifted groups were selected. The project staff and representatives of the Evaluation staff of SEDL met to decide what criterion should be used for selection of the gifted sample.

The test instruments used in this study--the WISC (1) Verbal and (2) Performance, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (3) Verbal and (4) Figural, and DeAvila's (5) Cartoon Conservation Scales are somewhat diverse measures of intellectual ability. In order to use these measures it was necessary to obtain cut-off points for the gifted group. Four raters independently established giftedness cut-off scores for each of these five measures for each grade level, kindergarten through third. Any child whose score was at or above one of the five cut-off scores was placed in the gifted group.

Each rater's cut-off scores are listed in Table 1 by test instrument and by grade level. Table 2 contains the number of gifted children each rater identified (by test instrument, by grade level) with his/her

TABLE 1

GIFTED CHILD CUTOFF SCORES ESTABLISHED BY JURY RATERS ON FIVE TEST INSTRUMENTS

GRADE	DE AVILA				WISC VERBAL				WISC PERFORMANCE				TORRANCE VERBAL				TORRANCE FIGURAL			
	M*	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER
K	13	23	23	23	101	116	101	129	111	120	127	127	37	72	64	72	164	226	207	332
First	14	21	21	21	95	116	100	125	107	118	111	125	34	69	69	69	173	233	202	290
Second	13	20	20	20	94	113	113	123	99	118	118	128	28	75	75	75	220	230	207	290
Third	19	22	22	22	101	118	118	123	111	125	125	125	44	72	62	62	250	227	250	425

*Initials of Jury Raters.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF GIFTED CHILDREN IDENTIFIED BY JURY RATERS ON FIVE TEST INSTRUMENTS

	DE AVILA				WISC VERBAL				WISC PERFORMANCE				TORRANCE VERBAL				TORRANCE FIGURAL			
GRADE	M*	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER	M	J	EL	ER
K	11	2	2	2	5	2	5	1	8	6	3	3	7	2	4	2	8	4	5	1
First	6	1	1	1	9	1	6	0	9	1	3	0	10	1	1	1	11	6	8	0
Second	6	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	7	2	2	1	7	1	1	1	5	3	6	0
Third	8	7	7	7	11	4	4	2	7	4	4	4	7	1	3	3	8	9	8	2

*Initials of Jury Raters.

respective cut-off scores. Table 3 presents the number of gifted children identified by each rater (collapsed across test and grade level) and the median number of gifted children identified by the four raters.

Correlations between each rater's ratings and the corresponding group median ratings are found in Table 4. These correlations provide measures of rater reliability by establishing the extent to which each rater agreed with the group median ratings. Three (J, EL, ER) of the four correlations were within an acceptable significance level while the fourth was not; consequently, the ratings of the fourth rater (M), which were not sufficiently in agreement with those of the other three raters, were dropped for purposes of obtaining a mean group rating.

Table 5 contains the rounded mean number of gifted children identified, listed by test instrument and by grade levels, computed on the basis of the three raters (J, EL, ER). The number of different children identified as gifted on at least one of the five test intruments were presented by grade level and by rater in Table 6.

Thirty-four (34) children across grade levels were selected into the gifted category on at least one of the five test instruments. Nine of these children were selected into the gifted category on more than one instrument. Of these 34 gifted children, 22 were among those for whom behavioral and adjectival ratings had been collected. Ratings were collected for a total of 54 children, the remaining 32 children fell into the normal group. The gifted sample had 17 males and 5 females; the normal sample had 18 males and 14 females.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF GIFTED CHILDREN IDENTIFIED BY EACH JURY RATER AND MEDIAN JURY RATING (COLLAPSED ACROSS TEST INSTRUMENTS AND GRADE LEVELS)

Number of Gifted Children Identified by Each Rater (Collapsed Across Tests and Grade Levels)				Median Number of Gifted Children Identified
M*	J	EL	ER	Median
11	2	2	2	2.16
6	1	1	1	1.16
6	1	1	1	1.16
8	7	7	7	7.16
5	2	5	1	3.50
9	1	6	0	3.50
4	2	2	1	2.00
11	4	4	2	4.00
8	6	3	3	4.50
9	1	3	0	2.00
7	2	2	1	2.00
7	4	4	4	4.16
7	2	4	2	3.00
10	1	1	1	1.16
7	1	1	1	1.16
7	1	3	3	3.00
8	4	5	1	4.50
11	6	8	0	7.00
5	3	6	0	4.00
8	9	8	2	8.00

*Initials of Jury Rater.

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN JURY RATERS AND GROUP MEDIAN

Rater	Mean Rating	Mean Median Rating	r	df
M*	7.70 (1.97)	3.45 (1.99)	.247	18
J	3.00 (2.30)	3.45 (1.99)	.923***	18
EL	3.80 (2.24)	3.45 (1.99)	.919***	18
ER	1.65 (1.61)	3.45 (1.99)	.404**	18

Standard deviations are in parentheses.

* Initials of Jury Rater.

** $p < .08$

*** $p < .001$

TABLE 5

ROUNDED MEAN (J*, F , ER) NUMBERS OF GIFTED CHILDREN IDENTIFIED BY JU RATERS ON FIVE TEST INSTRUMENTS

INSTRUMENTS

GRADE	DE AVILA	WISC VERBAL	WISC PERFORMANCE	TORRANCE VERBAL	TORRANCE FIGURAL
K	2	3	4	3	3
1st	1	2	1	1	5
2nd	1	2	2	1	3
3rd	7	3	4	2	6

*Initials of Jury Rater.

TABLE 6

NUMBERS OF DIFFERENT CHILDREN IDENTIFIED
AS GIFTED ON AT LEAST ONE TEST

GRADE	RATERS J	EL	ER	Rounded Mean** (J, EL, ER)
K	10	11	8	7
1st	9	14	2	9
2nd	4	6	2	4
3rd	16	15	13	14
Totals	39	46	25	34

* Initials of Jury Rater.
**The numbers in this column are not based on the arithmetic means of the raters' values in Table 6, but rather are based on the rounded means in Table 5.

RESULTS

Community perspectives. Over five million Mexican Americans reside in the United States. Fifty percent of our Mexican Americans are 18 years old or younger--a startling indication of the high birth rate in the Chicano population. Less than seven percent of all Mexican Americans residing in the Southwest are foreign born. Less than five percent are of mixed or foreign parentage. For many the family roots extend well into the history of these states containing a unique, albeit neglected (if not rejected) historical legacy. For others the immersion into the dominant culture is recent, alienating, hostile, and costly. There is a keen sensitivity in the Mexican American of his place in the hierarchy of United States social strata, as citizen, as indigenous resident, as immigrant (Romano, 1969).

The recognition that the Office of Education would propose funding this program in an attempt to begin to identify gifted potential within the Mexican American community brought mostly surprise, initially, from the respondents within the community. Some were suspicious and refused to participate: "What do they want to know now?" Others asked, "Will this really help my children?" A few other parents immediately stated that they believed that at least one, if not all, of their own children were gifted in some way. All of the parents interviewed, it is interesting to note, had expectations for their children: "I want my children to have the things I didn't have, that I couldn't have"; "I didn't have no schooling, but my children are in school!"

Among the young people surveyed and observed, children and teenagers--in their neighborhoods, schools, hang-outs--there seemed to be little difficulty in identifying the gifted or talented peer or in talking about giftedness and talent.

When queried on, "What it means to be smart in adult daily life", people responded with comments such as:

"...finding something that makes you happy and pursuing that. If you are smart you accept some things, sacrifice, set some goals that enhance you as a human being. In today's society, they pay a premium for being super-smart." (Female, 34, Management Professional.)

"...finding some good for himself and his community." (Female, 63, third grade education.)

"...para dar valor al Mexico-Americano, asking for what is just." (Female, 47, fourth grade, educated in Mexico.)

"...speak both languages perfect." (Male, 63, fifth grade education.)

"...making rational decisions based on past experiences and current experiences." (Male, 28, Professional Administrator,)

Respect, recognition, and self-esteem are primary to the Mexican American culture. Success, status, and talent combined with these primary values color the popular portrayal of the gifted Mexican American child.

As we reviewed the data from the interviews, we realized that the Mexican Americans in our sample did not make the clear-cut distinctions between giftedness and talent found in the professional literature. Rather, the distinctions that were made centered on habits, interests, and people with whom they interacted. It may be that only the discerning parent can make an honest distinction between a child's being gifted or talented, or perhaps young children are not really differentiated along these dimensions except, perhaps, in the most obvious and stereotypic ways, e.g., dancing and singing.

It would seem, then, that to the Mexican Americans interviewed it is not sufficient to be "intelligent" to be gifted; a child must also be vivo, listo--a gifted child, in short, must have verve, style. Being able to

"make it" suggests a special type of giftedness that can survive and succeed in an educationally and socially "incompatible" (Cárdenas & Cárdenas, 1973) environment (Laosa, personal communication).

The talented child, if he has had an opportunity to discover and develop his talent, exhibits a real joy in it. He spends much of his time practicing, often to the exclusion of other activities and friends. "Ignores his friends to pursue talent." One negative result of this might be that he displays his talent so much that he is called a show off. This child receives more attention than other children because of his talent. "They stand out more. People notice their talent," but this child also seeks attention. He enjoys being the center of attention, "Sometimes he is unhappy when no one pays attention to him." It is almost as if he requires attention, that is, an audience.

The gifted child is considered to be more aware of what is going on in the world than other children his age. As one teacher put it, "Other children are wondering if (an object) is red; he's wondering how it is that men really made it to the moon." Although Chicano gifted children are believed to be proud, they are not believed to be mental show offs, ordinarily. Their manner of speaking and range of knowledge draw the attention of sensitive adults, but they shy away from being the center of attention and very frequently help other children in class or siblings at home. They exhibit a type of quiet sophistication and maturity about intellectual matters.

The talented child is considered more active than the gifted child. Perhaps this is because of the difference in their interests. Of both of them it was said, "restless, don't like to be doing just one thing." The gifted child is often seen as quiet, serious, and pensive, though this is perhaps stereotypic.

Gifted children exhibit a strong, spontaneous desire for self-improvement. "Discovers his talent and keeps going from there to get better." "Tiene pensamientos de ser grande" (Has thoughts of becoming great). "Realizes the importance of trying." They are considered to be independent and self-reliant. "Does things on his own without being told." "Uses his own judgment." Perhaps this is one of the reasons they are thought of as leaders. "Others are always looking to them before they do anything." "Always want to organize something, and others want to do what they suggest." They are not only leaders of other children but also "the first to try things." "They think of ideas and make up games that others would not do."

Gifted children use their imaginations more freely and "talk and play with more imagination." "They influence people their way, they are innovators." They create games, songs, dances, art work, and stories and therefore enjoy these self-made activities rather than those structured for them.

The gifted and talented children seem to do well in school. But it is very interesting to note that the Mexican Americans we interviewed stressed class participation, a desire to learn more, and a studious nature much more than academic grades as indicators of intelligent behavior. Thus a form of "style" is recognized as an important concomitant of talent and giftedness. These children have a need to be involved in whatever activity they happen to be pursuing at the time. "Niños que se aplican, hacen lo que les interesa. Estas personas son muy trabajadoras, no son rincondosas." (Children who apply themselves, do what interests them. They work hard; they don't fool around.) They are "bored easily, if not actively involved in something."

Both the talented and gifted children are intelligent. The talented child is one with special abilities in one or more areas. Although "intelligent" was the most frequent response given for the gifted child, most people

felt that to be considered gifted "a child must not only have intelligence, but common sense and use them both well." Both are inquisitive, always asking *questions. The talented child is especially interested and eager to learn* about the area or areas in which he is talented. They are "not hesitant to show interest in whatever they are good at." The gifted child is not satisfied with a simplistic answer to his questions. Very often he will want to explore alternative questions: "but what if this happened...", "what if it were like this...?" Furthermore, the gifted child "knows how to make it in the Anglo world." Gifted leadership is daring, knowledgeable, articulate, and inviting: "Can speak well, can engage others in his activities, gets everybody in it."

It was stated that gifted and talented children are talkative, especially about their interests. It is believed that teachers often do not distinguish between the sincere and enthusiastic interest and creative ideas of a gifted child, on the one hand, and another child's desire to show off. Consequently, many of these bright children are labelled trouble-makers and teachers fail to encourage their interests or deal with the challenges their ideas might hold. With another type of population, Wallach and Kogan (1965) found similar "disruptive" tendencies among certain categories of bright or creative children.

A distinction between gifted and talented may be that the gifted child initiates conversation with adults and older children and maintains their genuine attention. "They like to hang around older people and prefer them to children." He "holds his own in a conversation with grown ups." He "keeps adults interested in what he's saying." But not all of the interviewees felt gifted and talented children were talkative. Almost as many said that they were quiet. "Es el más callado de los niños." He is "quiet, does not try to attract attention." In the classroom, he might be overlooked by all but the most observant teacher.

Some gifted and talented children have lots of friends. "Amistotos, tienen buenos modos con toda la gente." (They are friendly, they are nice to everybody.) They "have many friends and are well-liked." "Everyone instantly likes him because he's so smart and clever." Others do not have many friends for a number of reasons: (1) "would not have the same interests as peers," (2) "he's mature for his age, it is often difficult for him to find friends," (3) "they like to be alone more often than other kids," or (4) "alone they can concentrate better on their talents." But this is not to say that the gifted loner is necessarily disliked.

They seem to have developed other skills of social relatability valued highly enough to be mentioned as characteristics. They are sensitive children attuned to the needs of others. "They are usually more responsible and sensitive to others around them." At home the gifted child is helpful, assuming responsibility for chores and the care of brothers and sisters. In school, they help other children with their homeowrk. They are regarded as well-behaved, obedient children, but not afraid to speak their minds. They are kind, considerate, and willing to share. They are respectful and respected by peers and adults alike.

Gifted and talented children feel vibrations of resentment from peers and adults. Very often they will not show their talent to survive among peers and adults, who might view their ability as a threat, or because they are frustrated by the obvious lack of opportunities for its development. It should be noted that the Mexican American community considers environmental influences, school facilities, opportunities for development, recognition and encouragement by teachers, family income, and parental influence to be of paramount importance for the expression and development of talent.

How is it that a child comes to be considered gifted or talented? Some of the people interviewed believe that to be "muy inteligente, viene de alto, de

Dios." (very intelligent, comes from above, from God). "Que es un don;" it is a gift from God. Other people feel that even though a person might be born with this gift or talent, without a supportive environment, training and encouragement the gift will be lost or misdirected, as in the case of some gifted gang leaders (some of whom, we're happy to report, "went straight" as adults and became academic and financial leaders in their communities).

Many people feel that all children are gifted, but that many children, especially Mexican Americans, will never have an opportunity to develop to their fullest potential. The Mexican American's seeming willingness to recognize the diverse gifts of different persons, although perhaps not a popular idea among many educators of the gifted, may be a folk counterpart of Bloom's (1973) notion that if a gifted child were defined as one who scored in the top 10 percent on one or more of Thurstone's Primary Mental Abilities, then 60 percent of the nation's children would be considered gifted.

Passow (1972) recognized the need to conduct guidance and other ancillary services not only for the gifted student but also for the student's family. The debriefing which the project staff conducted for the interviewers and our own experiences in interviewing parents in the field indicated that a parental or family counseling effort seems indeed to be worthwhile. A number of parents of our potentially gifted children expressed concerns for providing adequate educational opportunities--particularly finding the needed finances for a college education--for their children.

Analyses of the Data. Multiple discriminant analysis was used to determine if the behaviors studied could adequately distinguish between gifted and normal children. Factor analysis was not attempted for a number of reasons: the sample was not random; the sample for which complete data

had been collected was small; and a factor match of the factor structure of the gifted and normal groups would have been necessary. With the small N, the factor match would probably not have been reliable or valid since the number of items exceeded the number of Subjects. Analyses of variance, however, were run separately on each item of the behavioral rating scale and the adjectival rating scale.

Multiple discriminant analyses were run on the data, using the behavior ratings and the adjective ratings as predictor variables in two separate analyses. The multiple discriminant analysis procedure may be viewed as an extension of a simple analysis of variance procedure, where instead of working with one dependent variable, the concern is with whether the groups differ on a number of dependent variables analyzed simultaneously. Essentially, such a procedure provides information concerning the extent and the manner in which two or more groups may be differentiated by a set of dependent variables operating together. In the case of the gifted project, the pupils were divided into two categories: gifted and non-gifted. The task was then to determine, via the multiple discriminant procedure, whether or not the behavior ratings and/or the adjective ratings allowed for discrimination between the two groups. When ratings on the scales were found to discriminate between the two groups, individual items in the rating scales were examined in an effort to determine which items contributed most to the discrimination.

In the discriminant analysis, an index called Wilks' lambda (Λ), is computed to provide information regarding the amount of variance accounted for by the predictor variables. The significance of lambda is tested with an F-ratio, which provides information concerning the probability that group differences as large or larger than those obtained could be produced by

drawing some number of random samples (in this case, two samples labeled "gifted" and "non-gifted") from the overall group of pupils.

The differentiation between the groups may exist along a number of dimensions or "functions," as they are called in the discriminant analysis. When only two groups are employed in the analysis, as was the case for the gifted project, only one discriminant function can be isolated. A $\underline{X}^2$ statistic is used to test the significance of each discriminant function.

All of the predictor variables (in this case, items on the behavior rating scale or the adjective rating scale) contribute to a greater or lesser extent in the discrimination obtained by each function. Item loadings on the discriminant function provide an indication of the degree to which each item contributed to the optimal discrimination obtained by that set of items.

In addition to performing the multivariate discriminant analyses, simple analyses of variance were done between the gifted and non-gifted groups, using each item of each of the two rating scales as a dependent variable separately.

Results from both the multivariate and univariate analyses are presented next.

Behavior ratings. When the behavior rating data were submitted to the multivariate discriminant analysis, a significant Wilks' lambda ($\underline{\Lambda} = .09$, $\underline{F}_{43,11} = 2.59$, $\underline{p} < .05$) was obtained, indicating that the probability was less than .05 that the gifted and non-gifted pupils had been assigned at random to their respective groups from a common student population. As was mentioned previously, two groups can only differ along one dimension in this type of analysis, and it was found that the dimension discriminated

TABLE 7

BEHAVIORAL ITEMS WHICH BEST DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN GIFTED AND NORMAL GROUPS ON THE DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION

Behavior Rating Item Number	Item Description	Loading
2	Other children always look for him/her and want to be around him/her	.35
25	Understands and remembers detailed instructions when given the first time.	.27
6	Accepts what parents tell him/her without question or without talking back when he/she is being corrected for doing something wrong.	-.26
39	Shows self-discipline in that he will not eat a snack right before a meal.	.25
21	Makes very high grades in school.	.25
16	Takes care of his/her things. When finished playing or working with something, returns it to its place.	.25
29	Uses a large vocabulary for his/her age.	.21
26	Learns things more quickly than other kids do.	.21
30	Speaks correctly, with good grammar for his/her age.	.20

to a significant extent between the gifted and non-gifted pupils ($\underline{X}^2$ = 78.25, $\underline{df}$ = 43, $\underline{p}$ < .002). Approximately 91% of the variance was accounted for by the items in the behavior rating scale.

Items were examined in terms of their loadings on the discriminant function in an effort to determine which items contributed most to the optimal discrimination between the two groups. Since no objective criterion for determining how high a loading must be in order to be significant exists, an arbitrary cutoff of a loading of .20 was established. Nine items in the behavior rating scale loaded .20 or above on the discriminant function, and these are listed on the following page, rank ordered by magnitude of loading.

All of the items but item 6 have positive loadings on the discriminant function, meaning that gifted pupils engage in the rated behaviors to a greater extent than non-gifted pupils. Item 6 is a reflection that gifted children, at least as represented by the present sample, are less inclined to accept parental rebuke without question than are non-gifted children.

Simple analyses of variance using behavior items as dependent variables revealed that the same behaviors were important in discriminating between the gifted and non-gifted groups when analyzed separately as were found when the items were considered simultaneously. Those items for which an F-ratio with a probability of less than .10 are listed in Table 8, in order of the magnitude of the probabilities. It will be seen that the items and their rank ordered importance are essentially the same as was determined in the multivariate analysis, except that fewer items were identified as important (using the arbitrary criterion of an F-ratio with a probability of .10 or less) for the univariate results.

TABLE 8

BEHAVIORAL ITEMS WHICH BEST DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN GIFTED AND NORMAL GROUPS ON UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Behavior Rating Item Number	F-Ratio (df = 1,53)	Probability of Obtaining F
2	6.78	.01
25	3.65	.06
6	3.53	.06
39	3.31	.07
21	3.29	.07
16	3.21	.08

The group means for all of the behavior rating items identified as important through either multivariate or univariate procedures are found in Table 9. Item means were derived from individual scores obtained on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 representing "almost always" and 5 representing "almost never."

TABLE 9

MEAN BEHAVIOR RATINGS FOR GIFTED AND NORMAL CHILDREN ON DISCRIMINATING ITEMS

Item	Gifted $\bar{X}$	Non-Gifted $\bar{X}$
2	1.63	2.61
25	1.91	2.64
6	4.14	3.33
39	2.36	3.15
21	1.50	2.09
16	2.45	3.31
29	2.68	3.24
26	1.77	2.33
30	2.00	2.48

Adjective ratings. The multivariate discriminant analysis using the 31 adjective rating items as predictor variables yielded statistics with probabilities considerably above the .05 level (Λ = .40, $F_{31,24}$ = 1.17, p = .35 and X^2 = 36.39, df = 31, p = .24), meaning that the adjective rating items, when analyzed simultaneously, did not discriminate between the gifted and non-gifted groups to a significant extent. Since the number of pupils (N = 54) was so small in relation to the number of predictor variables (31), it is likely that the error term is inflated considerably, thus reducing the power of the test. When a larger N, significant results might have been obtained. As it was, approximately 60 percent of the variance was accounted for by items on the adjective rating scale.

Simple analysis of variance results, in which each adjective rating item was treated separately as a dependent variable, yielded 11 items with F-ratios that had corresponding probabilities of less than .10. These 11 items and the F-ratios and probabilities associated with them are rank-ordered by probability level in Table 10. The group means for the 11 adjective rating items are found in Table 11. Each item was rated on a 7-point scale, with 1 associated with the left-most adjective and 7 with the adjective on the right side of the adjective pair.

TABLE 10

ADJECTIVAL ITEMS WHICH BEST DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN GIFTED AND NORMAL GROUPS ON UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Item Number	Item Description	F-Ratio (df = 1,54)	Probability of obtaining F
12	Serious - Sense of humor	10.77	.002
17	Intelligent - Slow	9.47	.004
23	Not smart - Smart	4.95	.03
21	Unsure, uncertain - Confident in self	4.66	.03
4	Creative - Unoriginal, unimaginative	4.11	.04
5	Content - Ambitious	3.37	.07
28	Dishonest - Tells truth	3.35	.07
30	Dependent - Independent	3.28	.07
16	Not curious - Curious	3.21	.08
29	Good judgment - Poor judgment	3.03	.08
20	Quiet - Expressive	2.79	.097

It appears that gifted children are rated as having a better sense of humor, greater intelligence, as being "smarter," having more self-confidence, as being more creative, more ambitious, more inclined to tell the truth, more independent, more curious, as having better judgment, and being more expressive than non-gifted children.

TABLE 11

MEAN ADJECTIVE RATINGS FOR GIFTED AND NON-GIFTED CHILDREN ON DISCRIMINATING ITEMS

Item No.	Item Description	Gifted $\bar{X}$	Non-gifted $\bar{X}$
12	Serious - Sense of Humor	5.87	4.18
17	Intelligent - Slow	1.87	3.09
23	Not smart - Smart	6.13	5.24
21	Unsure, uncertain - Confident in self	5.74	4.82
4	Creative - Unoriginal, unimaginative	1.87	2.73
5	Content - Ambitious	4.52	3.36
28	Dishonest - Tells truth	6.26	5.70
30	Dependent - Independent	4.22	3.24
16	Not curious - Curious	6.65	6.03
29	Good judgment - Poor judgment	2.17	2.87
20	Quiet - Expressive	5.39	4.48

Discussion of the basic analyses. The multivariate discriminate analysis of the 43 item behavioral rating scale yielded a significant difference between the two groups. Nine items of the behavioral rating scale loaded at .20 or above on the discriminant function. Simple analysis of variance using behavior items as dependent variables proved to be important in discriminating between the gifted and non-gifted groups also. The items for which an F-ratio with a probability of less than .10 are essentially the same as those which were determined by the multivariate analysis, except that fewer items were identified as important (by an arbitrary criterion) for the univariate results.

The multivariate discriminant analysis of the 31 adjective rating items did not discriminate between the gifted and non-gifted groups to a significant degree. However, the simple analysis of variance, in which each adjective rating item was treated separately as a dependent variable, yielded 11 items with F-ratios for which the corresponding probabilities are less than .10. These 11 items do tend to discriminate between the groups.

An examination of items in terms of their loadings on the discriminant function revealed those items which contributed most to the optimal discrimination between the two groups. No objective criterion has been established for determining how high a loading must be in order to be signficant. Since this is an exploratory study, aiming to include any significant behaviors, a loading of .20 was considered to be of importance.

In the course of developing the behavioral and adjectival rating scales, the items were revised after pilot testing. Still, while interviewing the parents of the children in the sample, the project staff took note of any

statements which seemed to be too wordy, unclear, or misleading. Due to the exploratory nature of the study, it is important to remember that the wording of an item can affect an informant's response, hence the utility of the item. Had the responses been significantly altered by rephrasing of the statements, item loadings on the discriminant function or their significance on the univariate analyses may have been different.

The multivariate analysis was only significant for the behavioral rating scale; thus, only the behavioral scale had items which loaded on a discriminant function. The interesting result to note is that items dealing with grades, a large vocabulary, and good grammar did not contribute heavily to the optimal discrimination between the two groups. If similar, future studies bore this out, these might be established as differences between how educators and the Mexican American community view giftedness.

CONCLUSION

As is stressed in the U. S. Office of Education's publication Education of the Gifted and Talented (1972) and throughout this report, not enough concern is given to the educational needs of gifted and talented children and, because of the scarcity of reliable identification measures, even less is given to gifted minority group children. The paucity of research on minority gifted children, especially Mexican American gifted children, has also been noted. The importance of a study of this nature, which sought to determine a community perspective on giftedness and also use observable behaviors as indicators of giftedness, is evident. It is necessary to stress, however, the exploratory nature of this study. It is the "first cut" at developing (1) a cultural-community based definition of giftedness in Mexican American children and (2) a measure for identifying Mexican American gifted children using behavioral statements.

The behavioral rating scale did differentiate between the gifted and non-gifted groups to a significant degree. In other words, parental ratings on the basis of observable behaviors alone serve to differentiate potentially gifted children. Since individual items on both the behavioral and adjectival rating scales also discriminated between the two groups, the results give an indication that the approach is worthy of further research, not only for minority groups in general but for the dominant ethnic group as well. Similar studies should be mounted in other areas of the Southwest, rural as well as urban. Such studies would reveal the differences as well as the commonalities in the perceptions of Mexican Americans on what giftedness is all about,

what kinds of behaviors reveal giftedness or potential giftedness, and what kinds of gifted behaviors are valued socially. Additions to and revisions of the rating scales would also make then usable and reliable for Mexican Americans in other parts of the country.

Although univariate and multivariate discriminant analyses were run on these data, other types of analyses could also be done. With a larger N and randomization of the sample, future researchers could do factor analyses of items in order to determine which variables define giftedness for this population. Relevant items could be combined in a manner which would weight each optimally in order to make this diagnosis more accurate. If a cross-cultural design were implemented, comparisons between or among groups would be possible, and the professions might also be able to see how close psychologically derived views of giftedness are related to the lay public. If the same or similar testing instruments were used in future research, an analysis within the gifted group should be undertaken. Those children selected for performing well on the WISC Verbal could be compared across behaviors with children selected by the other tests. Also, the use of rating scales should be expanded to include the perceptions of teachers and other community members, both adults and adolescents, and developed in a manner which would yield valid results regardless of the ethnicity of the rater.

Having administered the rating scales and worked with the resultant data, the project staff proposes at this time to (1) assemble a composite list/scale of items which might identify potentially gifted Mexican American children and (2) revise the wording of those items which presented difficulties during the data gathering phase of the project. Less than half of the items on each of the scales differentiated between the gifted

and non-gifted groups. Therefore, the staff proposes to combine the items on a shorter, more concise scale. Other items from the original scales have also been included if (1) the project staff decided that "nearly significant" items would have discriminated between the two groups had they been worded better or had the sample been larger, or (2) the items reflect an idea on giftedness and gifted behavior which was heavily stressed in the community survey but which did not show in the discriminant analyses.

The behavioral and adjectival rating scales which follow, then, consist of the items which meet the above criteria. Most of these retain their original wording, while others have been re-edited for clarity. Future experimental use of these instruments should employ several different judges (e.g., teacher and parent) in order to obtain ratings on the same traits in different settings. Also, the protocol may be profitably administered at several points in time during the early elementary years in order to monitor the behavior of children selected as potentially gifted and to identify "late bloomers."

Again it is important to underscore the idea that giftedness may refer to a whole set of characteristics or behaviors not all of which need be present in the typical behavior of any one person. Indeed, some of these attributes may seem contradictory. It is probably more accurate to say that patterns of traits are the key to understanding gifted children, although there may be some common traits in the group as well. What commonalities and patterns of differences (types of giftedness) may ultimately emerge is still an empirical question, one which may be amenable to cross-cultural investigation.

B E H A V I O R R A T I N G S C A L E

THIS IS AN EXPERIMENTAL INSTRUMENT
RESULTS OBTAINED CANNOT BE CONSIDERED VALID

THIS INSTRUMENT SHOULD NOT BE A CRITERION FOR IDENTIFICATION
OF GIFTED CHICANO CHILDREN UNTIL IT IS VALIDATED

Please answer these questions about _____.
(Child's Name)

How frequently do these things happen with _____?
(Child's Name)

	Almost Always	Usually		Only Sometimes	Almost Never
Other kids always look for him/her and want to be around him/her. e.g., Kids usually congregate around where he/she lives.					
Accepts what parents tell him/her without question or without talking back when he/she is being corrected for doing something wrong.					
Takes care of his/her things. When finished playing or working with something, returns it to its place.					
Makes very high grades in school.					
Understands and remembers detailed instructions when given the first time; doesn't need them repeated.					
Learns things more quickly than other kids do.					
Uses a large vocabulary for her/his age.					
Speaks correctly, with good grammar for her/his age.					
Shows self-discipline. For example, will not eat a snack right before a meal.					
Can carry on conversations with older children and adults and keeps them interested in what he/she is saying.					
Figures out things or works out problems and finds solutions which other kids probably are unable to do.					
Is not easily distracted while working or playing; doesn't get sidetracked easily, like by T. V. or other children.					
Is creative. Example, makes up his/her own games and thinks up things to do.					
Likes to help parents at home with many household chores.					
Accepts what parents tell him/her without question or without talking back, when in a conversation something is said that he/she doesn't believe.					
Speaks Spanish fluently; can speak English only so-so.					
Speaks English fluently; can speak Spanish only so-so.					
Speaks both Spanish and English very well.					
Shows self-discipline.					
Will do required schoolwork or household chores without having to be told.					
Has special interests with which he/she spends much time, like hobbies, collections or projects.					

A D J E C T I V A L S C A L E

THIS IS AN EXPERIMENTAL INSTRUMENT
RESULTS OBTAINED CANNOT BE CONSIDERED VALID

THIS INSTRUMENT SHOULD NOT BE A CRITERION FOR IDENTIFICATION
OF GIFTED CHICANO CHILDREN UNTIL IT IS VALIDATED

Children have some of all of these characteristics at one time or another. We want you to mark the box on the scale that you think best describes the way _____ is most of the time.
(Child's name)

Serious								Sense of humor
Intelligent								Slow
Unsure, uncertain								Confident in self
Not smart								Smart
Creative								Uncriginal, unimaginative
Content								Ambitious
Dishonest								Tells truth
Dependent								Independent
Not curious								Curious
Good judgment								Poor judgment
Quiet								Expressive
Not competitive								Competitive
Uncooperative								Cooperative
Not inquisitive								Inquisitive
Unreliable & Irresponsible								Dependable & Responsible
Considerate, Helpful								Inconsiderate, Not helpful
Immature								Mature
Persistent								Gives up easily
Sharing								Possessive
Aloof								Friendly

SUMMARY OF TECHNIQUES FOR IDENTIFYING GIFTED MINORITY CHILDREN

A most pressing question in the minds of educators concerned with gifted and talented youngsters and those working directly with gifted children is--knowing that most traditional measures do not adequately identify minority potentially gifted, how do we identify these children? Identification procedures or strategies for all gifted and talented children are becoming more diverse, considering other abilities in addition to those evident in prior academic achievement or global I.Q. (For a discussion of these diverse abilities, see Guilford & Hoepfner, 1966, and Kleinfeld, 1973.) This diversity is reflected in the techniques which can be employed, such as nomination, creative products, situational problem-solving, and the use of action agencies, in addition to the more traditional use of the individual I.Q. test and achievement tests. This section will relate these techniques to the selection of minority potentially gifted youngsters.

Although we know that most traditional measures do not adequately identify minority potentially gifted children, we also know that they will continue to be used because they are considered by many to be the best indicators of academic potential or high intelligence (see Skager & Fitz-Gibbon, 1972). However, individual I.Q. tests, which are rarely used, are far superior to group measures as a rule (Sheldon & Manolakes, 1954; Pegnato & Birch, 1959; Martinson, 1961; Walton, 1961). Therefore, the project staff reiterates several points made earlier in the paper. First, psychometricians have failed to take into consideration some of the differences between middle class Anglos and minority groups. The latter often (1) do not speak or understand the language of the test; (2) have not had the opportunities to acquire the knowledge necessary to pass the tests; (3) have not been exposed

to testing situations and have not developed test-taking strategies; and (4) have a different cultural background, but are penalized by lower scores on I.Q. tests for not having acculturated. Secondly, as Bruch (1972) suggests, standardized tests are applicable for the purpose of identification only to the extent of the similarity between the individual Black student's economic and cultural background and that of the normative group. Thirdly, educators of the gifted are moving away from using any one criterion for identification (Cline, Needham, & Richards, 1963; Guilford, 1972). Some other factors which should be taken into consideration are demographic variables, personality factors, creativity scores, and the attitude of teachers and school administrators toward (1) the minority groups, (2) gifted children, and (3) the existence of giftedness among the minorities. Fourthly, the tests should not be used as screening measures to bar participation, but rather any procedure used should stress a search for talent.

The project staff realizes that current tests of general intelligence will identify those Mexican American children who are gifted in the traditional, dominant group sense, but is is likely that most of these children will be middle-class Mexican Americans or highly acculturated or already socioeconomically mobile. But consideration must be given to psychometrically naive or Spanish-speaking Mexican American children, not because they deserve any favors, but because the very nature of most tests of ability and achievement is a barrier to their identification, a barrier that has little to do with traits ostensibly tapped by these instruments (Bernal, 1972a).

Educators of the gifted who truly want to identify potentially gifted bilingual Mexican Americans must train and use bilingual Mexican American examiners (Garcia & Zimmerman, 1972). These examiners can agree among

themselves on the terminology (so as not to bias the test) for administering the test in Spanish. They can also set the child at ease in a variety of ways (Fay & Oakland, 1971), including speaking to the child in Spanish (Garcia & Zimmerman, 1972) and making it known to the child that responses in Spanish are correct and acceptable. (Remember that in most schools English is still the school language, that Spanish is often not understood, or, in many cases, tolerated by the teachers.)

Secondly, if educators of the gifted are sincere in their search for talent among the minorities, then they should pay less attention to the traditional cut-off points for giftedness and pay more attention to the rank order of I.Q. scores. (See Skager & Fitz-Gibbon, 1972, for one such technique.) They could select a percentage of scores rather than a cut-off point of 130.

Thirdly, perhaps Mercer's (1972) procedure of taking socio-cultural differences into account when interpreting the meaning of a particular child's score pertaining to mental retardation can be adapted to interpret a score for identifying a child as potentially gifted. Certainly the technique used in this study for obtaining parental ratings of their children's behaviors for this research was modeled after her "pluralistic diagnosis" scheme, and similar--but perhaps more informal--techniques may be used by schools seeking to confirm their tentative identification of potentially gifted minority children.

Nominations can also serve for initial referral, but their unreliability would seem to preclude their exclusive use (Gallagher, 1959), although Sanborn, Pulvino, and Wunderlin (1971) have devised a multiple nomination and checklist technique which apparently avoids some of the usual pitfalls, at least with older students. These nominations can come from a number of sources: (1) classroom teachers, (2) teachers of specific content areas, (3) bilingual teacher aides, (4) a selection panel,

(5) older gifted students, (6) neighborhood action agencies, and (7) parents. In early elementary grades one of the best sources of nominations is the classroom teacher or aide. This person spends a great deal of time with the students and can learn each one's areas of strength and potentiality. Parents are sometimes the ones who recognize giftedness (Southern Regional Project, 1962) and can nominate their children for a gifted program by (1) seeking to enroll their child in a program or (2) by the responses they would give to a checklist of behavioral items similar to the one used in this study.

In the upper elementary grades, junior high, and high school, teachers in specific content areas can be asked to make nominations. Obvious areas come to mind--art, music, drama, speech, dance, i.e., the creative arts. But it is also possible to be creative in other areas--science, history, and math, for example. It is reasonable to suppose that potentially gifted Chicano children--and many others, for that matter--(Southern Regional Project, 1962) may not evidence their abilities early or in all academic areas; hence, professional educators in distinct courses should be alert to spotting and nurturing special interests and calling to the attention of the school children who are "late bloomers" or who otherwise have escaped detection as potentially gifted.

A selection panel can also be used to identify and bring gifted youngsters into a program. The panel should have input from a number of sources, but its actual membership should not be so large as to prove dysfunctional. It should include (1) members of the school's administrative or counseling staff as well as (2) teaching or supervisory personnel involved in the gifted program, and (3) persons from the community recognized as gifted or talented in a field that is or could be explored in the gifted program.

A very important source of information about potentially gifted minority children, one that has not frequently been tapped, is the neighborhood action agency, e.g., a settlement house, clinic, or community center. This technique has been very successfully used for bringing potentially gifted children to the attention of the Creative Learning Center in Dallas (Tittle, 1973). There, training sessions were held with the professional staffs of several community agencies to describe the Center's program and the general behavioral characteristics of the child being sought. These professionals included public health nurses, welfare case workers, field workers with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, social workers at children's hospitals and clinics, ministers, and staffs from community centers, nurseries, day care centers, Catholic schools, and other agencies or individuals dealing with young children. The immediate response showed that professionals working with low income families and who had an opportunity to observe behavior of children directly or as an ancillary part of their work could be used effectively to obtain referrals of potentially gifted minority children to the Center.

Dr. John Gladfelter, a clinical psychologist who has a great interest in gifted children and the Center's work, wrote up a list of general traits which could be used by these professionals in the casual identification of potentially gifted minority children. Some of the criteria are:

(1) walks and talks at an early age

(2) has a long attention span

(3) shows interest in something unusual for a child that age

(4) has a chameleon quality: makes adjustments necessary for present conditions

(5) can be shy, withdrawn, and a loner

(6) has an abiding curiosity

(7) can label and match pictures with words in categories at an early age

(8) at age two knows (can name or point to) parts of face, hands, feet, elbows, knees, shoulders, chin, tongue

(9) has older siblings that are recognized as being bright

(10) possesses a keen sense of humor

(11) is seldom placid, is stubborn

He emphasizes that these children are not parrots, or mimics, and that they do not always exhibit behavior expected by adults. The professionals are also reminded that economic and social conditions have made these children fearful of authority figures, frustrated with education in the public school, and that they have not had many opportunities for decision-making. Constant overt discrimination towards themselves and their families has affected their self concept. But many of these same conditions have also fostered a fierce independence, unusual skills in self-preservation and adaptation, and an intense devotion to family.

In some instances when junior high or high schools are conveniently located, older gifted students can work with the younger, potentially gifted students, and perhaps aid in their identification. The participation of older gifted minority students would be especially useful in developing situational problem-solving experiences. Bruch (1972) suggests using situational problem-solving tasks of interpersonal relations, leadership, and everyday and complex problems faced by impoverished minorities in identifying the potentially gifted. Role-playing as well as written and taped responses are useful for identification.

Teachers and others selecting children for a gifted program must also keep in mind that all children are unique. The gifted will not all be one type of child, which makes it so difficult to identify them. Some of the

gifted minority students will be verbally fluent and have vivacious personalities; others will be shy, withdrawn, and have a rebellious attitude toward teachers and schools. Some will be talented in many areas. Others will be talented in only one. Some will have taught themselves to read at an early age. Others will not be able to read until a teacher works through their talents to develop an interest in reading. Some will be academically gifted; others will be underachievers, but extremely gifted in the areas of leadership and interpersonal relations.

By using a number of diverse techniques for identifying gifted youngsters, more of the different types of gifted children can be included in classes for the gifted so long as these programs can accommodate their diversities and develop their competencies.

APPENDIX A

Community Survey: English

INTRODUCTION

My name is _____, and I'm working on a study of the Mexican American culture with the Southwest Lab about talented and gifted children. We all know that everybody is different from everybody else in some ways. We are especially interested in the very talented and the very gifted Mexican American child.

Will you help me in this study by giving me some of your ideas?

Yes

No, not sure

IF NO OR NOT SURE, GIVE MORE BACKGROUND AND WARMUP AND TRY AGAIN FOR COOPERATION. IF STILL NO, STOP.

Section I

IF YES: First, let's talk about <u>talented</u> people. Let me tell you a story about a talented little girl:

There was a little girl who even as a baby loved to try to dance. Everyone could tell she was a natural dancer. She begged her parents to let her take dancing lessons, and then they sent her to study dancing in the classes held by the City Recreation Department. They saved a little money and bought the material for her dancing dresses, and her mother made these for her. Before long the little girl was the first in her dancing class, and even danced better than the children who had been studying dancing for some time. Her teacher asked her to perform not only with the other boys and girls, but also by herself. Everyone was impressed with her ability to dance.

There are other examples of talented people in our culture--like the golfer Lee Trevino, singer Vikki Carr and the artist Porfirio Salinas.

1. What we want to know is: What these people were like as children--and what the little girl in the story is probably like. What are ways <u>you</u> would describe talented children?

GIVE RESPONDENT TIME TO THINK AND ANSWER. REPEAT THE QUESTION IF NECESSARY.

IF RESPONDENT TALKS ONLY ABOUT THE SPECIFIC TALENTED ACTIVITIES, ASK:

2. What do you think these children are like around the house or with their friends? How do especially talented children act different from other children?

IF RESPONDENT GIVES NON-BEHAVIORAL ADJECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OR TRAITS, RECORD THEM AND THEN ASK:

3. What are some of the things that you can see that talented children do to show that they are _____?
(traits mentioned)

PROBES: What other things would talented children probably do?
How else would talented children differ from other kids?

I would like you to get a picture in your mind, a picture of a very talented child, a child who's got a little something extra. Are you thinking of a child? Do you have an image?

4. When you think of a very talented child(under 8 years of age), do you think of this child being _____male or

_____female

5. Do you think of (her/him) being _____Anglo or

_____Mexican American

IF MEXICAN AMERICAN:
Does (he/she) have

_____light skin or

_____dark skin

6. In what areas do you think Mexican-Americans are especially talented?

PROBE: What else? What other things do Mexican-Americans do particularly well?

7. Do you know anybody personally whom you would say is very talented?

Yes

No

IF NO: GO ON TO NEXT SECTION

IF YES: What does this person do?

How is (he/she) different from other people, besides having talent?

IF YES BUT A CHILD NOT MENTIONED: Do you know any children you think are very talented?

yes

no

IF NO: GO ON TO NEXT SECTION

IF YES: Tell me about (him/her)

What does (he/she) do that you think is different from other children?

Section II

Now, let's talk about gifted, very smart people--people who are really with it. Here is a story about a little boy who is considered gifted:

There was a little boy who did very unusual things and impressed his parents as being exceptionally smart. His parents sometimes said that they did not understand how they had such an intelligent child. He was very different from his brother and sisters and very different from the other children in the neighborhood. Whenever relatives of the family would visit, everyone was impressed with the things the little boy said and did.

8. What do you think the little boy in the story is probably like?

How would you describe him?

REPEAT QUESTION IF NECESSARY

9. What do you think intellectually gifted children are like at home around the house or with their friends? How are they different from other children?

IF RESPONDENT GIVES NON-BEHAVIORAL ADJECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OR TRAITS, RECORD THEM AND THEN ASK:

10. What are some of the things these children would do that you can see to show that they are _____?
(traits mentioned)

PROBES: What other things would gifted children probably do? How else would gifted children differ from other kids?

I would like you to get a picture or an image of a very smart child, a child who is really with it.
Are you thinking of a child?

11. When you think of a very gifted child (under 8 years of age), do you think of this child being _____male or

_____female

12. Do you think of (her/him) being _____Anglo or

_____Mexican-American

IF MEXICAN AMERICAN:
Does (he/she) have
_____light skin or

_____dark skin

13. In what areas do you think Mexican-Americans are especially gifted?

PROBE: What else? What other things do Mexican-Americans do particularly well?

14. Do you know anybody personally whom you would say is very gifted?

_____Yes

_____No

IF NO: GO ON TO NEXT SECTION

IF YES: What does this person do?

How is (he/she) different from other people, besides being gifted?

IF YES BUT A CHILD NOT MENTIONED: Do you know any children you think are very gifted?

_____yes

_____no

IF NO: GO TO NEXT SECTION

IF YES: Tell me about (him/her).

What does (he/she) do that you think is different from other children?

IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED QUESTIONS ON GIFTED BUT NOT TALENTED, GO BACK TO TO TALENTED SECTION TO SEE IF HE CAN ANSWER THEM NOW.

IF NOT, GO ON TO NEXT SECTION

Section III

Now, we need some information on you--for tabulating the data. We will not use your name in our analysis.

15. What is your relationship to the head of your household? _____.

16. (Are you) : employed?
(Is the head of your household)

_____Full time

_____Part time

_____Not employed

IF NOT EMPLOYED, ASK:

(Is the head of household) :
(Are you)

_____Retired

_____Seeking work

_____Unable to work

What did (he/you) do when working? _____

_____(SPECIFIC)

IF EMPLOYED, ASK:

What does (he/you) do? _____

How long has (he/you) done it? _____

What did (he/you) do before? _____

17. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

_____none

_____Less than primary

_____Completed primary

_____Less than high school

_____Completed high school

_____Some college

_____4 year college graduate

_____Some graduate school

_____Professional degree (MA, PhD, Law degree)

18. How many children (under 18) live in this household? _____

19. What language is spoken most often in the home?

_____Mostly Spanish
_____Mostly English
_____Almost equal

20. What language is spoken most often among the adults?
IF CHILDREN LIVE HERE

_____Mostly Spanish
_____Mostly English
_____Almost equal

21. What language is spoken most often among the children?
IF THERE ARE CHILDREN

_____Mostly Spanish
_____Mostly English
_____Almost equal

22. What language is spoken most often between parents and children?
IF THERE ARE CHILDREN

_____Mostly Spanish
_____Mostly English
_____Almost equal

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS:

Name _____

Address _____

Sex or respondent _____

APPENDIX B

Community Survey: Spanish

INTRODUCCIÓN

Yo soy _____, y estoy haciendo un estudio para el Laboratorio del Sudoeste tocante a la cultura México-Americana. Este estudio se trata de aquellos niños México-Americanos que tengan habilidades o capacidades especiales. Como sabemos que todos somos diferenten en muchas maneras, estamos especialmente interesados en los niños México-Americanos de mucho talento y de mucha inteligencia.

¿Podría usted darme sus opiniones para ayudarme a completar este proyecto? No hay contestaciones correctas o incorrectas; solamente queremos saber su opinión.

¿Podría usted ayudarme? _____ SÍ.

_____ NO, o no estoy seguro.

IF NO OR NO ESTOY SEGURO TRY AGAIN FOR COOPERATION. IF STILL NO, STOP.

Seccion I

IF SÍ:

Primero vamos a hablar de las personas de mucho talento. Permítame decirle la historia de una niña con talento.

> Había una niña a quien desde chiquita le encantaba bailar. Todos notaban que tenía talento para el baile. Ella les pidió a sus "papases" que le dieran lecciones de baile, y los papases la mandaron a tomar clases de baile al City Recreation Department (for San Antonio: Guadalupe Community Center). Sus padres ahorraron un poco de dinero y le compraron material para sus trajes de baile, y su mamá se los hizo. Bailaba major que los niños que habían estudiado por más tiempo. Su maestra la hacía que bailara sola y también con otros niños porque bailaba tan bien. Todos estaban muy impre impresionados con su habilidad.

Hay muchas personas con talente entre los México-Amreicanos--por ejemplo, el golfero Lee Treviño, la cantora Rosita Fernandez, y el pintor Porfirio Salinas.

1. Lo que queremos saber es esto: ¿Cómo serían estas personas cuando eran niños--y cómo será la niña de la historia que le acabo de contar? ¿Qué son algunos de los modos de niños con talento?

GIVE RESPONDENT TIME TO THINK AND ANSWER. REPEAT THE QUESTION IF NECESSARY. IF RESPONDENT TALKS ONLY ABOUT SPECIFIC TALENTED ACTIVITIES, ASK:

2. ¿Cómo cree usted que son estos niños en sus casas o con sus amigos? ¿Cómo son los niños de mucho talento? ¿Son diferentes a los niños que no tienen tanto talento?

If sí, ¿Cómo son diferentes?

If no, ¿Entonces cree que son iguales a los niños sin tanto talento?
IF SÍ, GO TO #4.

IF RESPONDENT GIVES NONBEHAVIORAL, ADJECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAITS, RECORD THEM AND THEN ASK:

3. ¿Cuáles son algunas cosas que se pueden ver o notar en niños de mucho talento que los hacen parecer _____?
(traits mentioned)

PROBES:

¿Qué otras cosas que demuestran talento pueden hacer estos niños? ¿En cuáles otros modos son ellos diferentes a los otros niños?

Imagínese usted un retrato de un niño o a una niña con mucho talento (menos de 8 años de edad).

¿Ya tiene la imagen?

4. ¿Piensa usted que es:

_____ niño, o

_____ niña?

5. ¿Piensa usted que es:

_____ Anglo, o

_____ México-Americano?

IF MÉXICO-AMERICANO,

_____ ¿Es güero, o

_____ moreno?

6. ¿Conoce usted a alguien con mucho talento? Con "talento" quiero decir alguien que usted cree que es muy talentoso--no tiene que ser alguien que es reconocido por toda la gente.

_____ Sí

_____ No

IF NO GO TO NEXT SECTION.

IF SÍ:

¿Qué hace esta persona?

Además de tener talento, ¿cómo es ella/él diferente a otras personas?

PROBE: En sus modos o maneras

IF SÍ, BUT CHILD NOT MENTIONED:

¿Conoce usted a un niño o a una niña que tiene talento?

_____ Sí

_____ No

IF NO, GO ON TO NEXT SECTION.

IF SÍ:

Platíqueme de él/ella. ¿Qué es lo que hace este niño/esta niña diferente a otros niños?

PROBE: En sus modos o maneras.

7. ¿En qué cosas cree usted que los México-Americanos tienen talentos especiales?

PROBE: ¿Qué más? ¿Qué otras cosas hacen especialmente bien los México-Americanos?

Sección II

Ahora, vamos a hablar de personas que son muy inteligentes o vivas. Ésta es una historia de un muchachito que consideramos muy vivo y muy inteligente.

> Había un muchachito que era muy inteligente. Sus padres a veces no comprendían como ellos podrían tener un niño con tanta inteligencia. Él era diferente a sus hermanitos y sus hermanitas y diferente a los demás niños de la vecindad. Todos los amigos y parientes se impresionaban mucho con lo que él decía y también con lo que hacía.

8. ¿Cómo cree usted que sería el muchachito de la historia? ¿Qué me puede decir de él? ¿Cómo cree usted que era el niño?

REPEAT QUESTION IF NECESSARY

9. ¿Cómo piensa usted que son estos niños de mucha inteligencia, en la casa y con sus amigos? ¿Son diferentes a otros niños?

If sí, ¿En qué modos o maneras son diferentes?

If no, ¿Entonces cree usted que son iguales a los niños que no son tan vivos, tan inteligentes?
IF SÍ, GO TO #11.

IF RESPONDENT GIVES NONBEHAVIORAL, ADJECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OR TRAITS, RECORD THEM AND THEN ASK:

10. ¿Cuáles son algunas cosas que se pueden ver o notar en estos niños vivos que los hacen parecer_____?
(traits mentioned)

PROBES:

¿Qué otras cosas hacen estos niños de mucha inteligencia? ¿En qué otros modos son estos niños diferentes a los otros niños?

Imagínese a un niño o a una niña muy inteligente, muy vivo (de menos de 8 años de edad). ¿Ya tiene la imagen?

11. ¿Piensa usted que es:

_____ niño, o

_____ niña?

12. ¿Piensa usted que es:

_____ Anglo, o

_____ México-Americano?

IF MÉXICO-AMERICANO

_____ ¿Es güero, o

_____ moreno?

13a. ¿Conoce usted a alguien que usted considera muy inteligente?

_____ Sí

_____ No

IF NO, GO ON TO NEXT SECTION.

IF SÍ:

¿Qué hace esta persona?

Además de ser muy inteligente, ¿cómo es esta persona diferente a otras personas?

IF SÍ BUT A CHILD IS NOT MENTIONED:

13b. ¿Conoce usted a algún niño que usted considera muy inteligente?

_____ Sí

_____ No

IF NO: GO ON TO NEXT SECTION.

IF SÍ:

Dígame algo de él/ella. ¿Qué es lo que hace este niño/esta niña diferente a los otros niños que no son tan vivos o inteligentes?

14. ¿En qué cosas piensa usted que los México-Americanos tienen capacidades especiales?

IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED QUESTIONS ON GIFTED BUT NOT TALENTED, GO BACK TO SECTION I TO SEE IF HE CAN ANSWER NOW.

IF NOT, GO ON TO SECTION III.

Sección III

Ahora necesitamos más informaciones sobre usted para el estudio. Para esto no vamos a usar su nombre.

15. ¿Qué relación tiene usted con la encargado/el encargado de esta casa?

_____

16. ¿Trabaja usted?
El encargado/la encargada de esta casa, ¿tiene trabajo:

_____ permanente o

_____ parte del tiempo?

_____ Está sin empleo.

IF NOT EMPLOYED, ASK:

El encargado/la encargada de esta casa, ¿está:

_____ retirado

_____ buscando trabajo?

_____ no puede trabajar.

Cuando trabajaba, ¿qué clase de trabajo hacía?

_____

IF EMPLOYED, ASK:

¿Qué hace usted? _____

¿Cuánto tiempo lo ha hecho? _____

¿Qué hacía antes? _____

17. ¿Cuál nivel de educación ha completado usted?

_____ Ninguno

_____ Menos de primaria

_____ Primaria

_____ Menos de secundaria (high school)

_____ Secundaria (high school)

_____ Un poco de colegio

_____ Graduado de colegio (4 años)

_____ Título profesional (MA, Ph.D, abogado)

18. ¿Cuántos niños menores de 18 años viven en esta casa?

IF NO CHILDREN LIVE THERE, ASK:

19. ¿Cuál idioma se habla más en esta casa?

_____ Más español

_____ Más inglés

_____ Lo mismo

IF CHILDREN LIVE THERE, ASK:

¿Cuál idioma se habla más entre los adultos?

_____ Más español

_____ Más inglés

_____ Lo mismo

¿Cuál idioma se habla más entre los niños?

_____ Más español

_____ Más inglés

_____ Lo mismo

¿Cuál idioma se habla más entre los adultos y los niños?

_____ Más español

_____ Más inglés

_____ Lo mismo

RESPONDENT DATA

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

_____

SEX _____

APPENDIX C

Original Behavior Rating Scale

ORIGINAL BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Please answer these questions about _____.
(Child's Name)

How frequently do these things happen with _____?
(Child's Name)

	Almost Always	Usually		Only Sometimes	Almost Never
Is noticed by adults and commented on favorably. e.g., "You must be proud of your child for ..."					
Other kids always look for him/her and want to be around him/her. e.g., Kids usually congregate around where he/she lives.					
Adapts to new situations and does not show stress. e.g., When going from home to school for the first time. e.g., Moving to new neighborhood and having to make new friends.					
Expresses confidence and trust in self even with new experiences; e.g., "I know I can do ..."					
Is not afraid to speak up.					
Accepts what parents tell him/her without question or without talking back:					
a) When he/she is being corrected for doing something wrong.					
b) When being told what to do, as a chore or errand.					
c) When in a conversation, something is said that he/she doesn't believe.					
Adjusts or changes behavior in response to the needs or moods of others. e.g., Stops playing to help a smaller child who has been hurt. e.g., Stops making noise in the house when mother has a headache or is asleep.					
Is the first choice of other children in choosing sides for games.					
Is creative. e.g., Makes up his/her own games and thinks up things to do.					
Knows how to deal with others, both adults and other children in order to get what he/she wants.					
Organizes and takes charge of activities; doesn't just wait to join in.					
Has times when he/she prefers to be alone rather than with other children.					
When playing at home alone, does not have to be entertained. Can stay occupied and busy on his/her own.					
Takes care of his/her things. When finished playing or working with something, returns it to its place.					
Could be given charge of looking after younger brothers and sisters or younger children.					
Takes up for brothers and sisters; won't let others pick on them; protects and defends family and close friends.					

	Almost Always		Usually		Only Sometimes	Almost Never
Likes to help parents at home with many household chores.						
Reads a lot; enjoys books in general.						
Makes very high grades in school.						
Is persistent; doesn't give up a task until it's complete. Finishes whatever is started.						
Figures out things or works out problems and finds solutions which other kids probably are unable to do.						
Is not easily distracted while working or playing; doesn't get sidetracked easily, like by T.V. or other children.						
Understands and remembers detailed instructions when given the first time; doesn't need them repeated.						
Learns things more quickly than other kids do.						
Takes longer to learn things.						
Can carry on conversations with older children and adults and keeps them interested in what he/she is saying.						
Uses a large vocabulary for his/her age.						
Speaks correctly, with good grammar for his/her age.						
Speaks clearly, with good pronunciation.						
Speaks Spanish.						
Speaks English.						
Speaks a mixture of Spanish and English.						
Looks for reassurance from parents; keeps asking if he/she is doing something right.						
Likes his/her teachers.						
Is spirited, active, sometimes mischievous.						
Competes with brothers and sisters for parents' attention.						
Shows self-discipline: a) Will not eat a snack before a meal.						
b) Will do required schoolwork or household chores without having to be told.						
c) Imposes rules on self as well as others in games.						
Has special interests with which he/she spends much time, like hobbies, collections or projects.						
Is hard to get to know because he/she is quiet and keeps so much inside.						

APPENDIX D

Original Adjectival Rating Scale

ORIGINAL ADJECTIVAL RATING SCALE

Children have some of all of these characteristics at one time or another. We want you to make the box on the scale that you think best describes the way _____ is most of the time.
(Child's Name)

Short								Tall
Mature								Immature
Dull								Sharp, witty
Creative								Unoriginal, unimaginative
Content								Ambitious
Easy going								Moody, temperamental
Not competitive								Competitive
Cooperative								Uncooperative
Disobedient								Obedient
Not self-centered								Self-centered
Bossy, Domineering								Goes along with others
Serious								Sense of humor
Persistent								Gives up easily
Impatient								Patient
Sharing								Possessive
Not curious								Curious
Intelligent								Slow
Unreliable & Irresponsible								Dependable & Responsible
Considerate, Helpful								Inconsiderate, Not helpful
Quiet								Expressive
Unsure, uncertain								Confident in self
Restless, tense, nervous								At ease, Relaxed
Not smart								Smart
Adventuresome								Not adventuresome
Occupied, busy								Day dreamer
Friendly								Aloof
Forceful								Shy, modest
Dishonest								Tells truth
Good judgment								Poor judgment
Dependent								Independent
Not inquisitive								Inquisitive

REFERENCES

Abraham, W. Common sense about gifted children. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Baldwin, J. W. The relationship between teacher-judged giftedness, a group intelligence test and an individual intelligence test with possible gifted kindergarten pupils. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1962, 6, 153-56.

Barbe, W. B. One in a thousand--a comparative study of moderately and highly gifted elementary school children. Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education, 1964.

Bernal, E. M., Jr. Comparative concept learning among Anglo, Black, and Mexican American children under standard and facilitation conditions of task administration. In E. Casavantes (Chm.), Effects of cultural variables on Mexican Americans. Symposium presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., September 1971.

Bernal, E. M., Jr. Assessing assessment instruments: A Chicano perspective. Paper prepared for the Regional Training Program to serve the Bilingual/Bicultural Exceptional Child, Montal Educational Associates, Sacramento, February 1972 (a).

Bernal, E. M., Jr. Curriculum development for the bilingual/bicultural exceptional child. Paper prepared for the Regional Training Program to serve the Bilingual/Bicultural Exceptional Child, Montal Educational Associates, Sacramento, February 1972 (b).

Bernal, E. M., Jr. Concept learning among Anglo, Black, and Mexican American children using facilitation strategies and bilingual techniques. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1972, No. 72-15.

Bloom, B. S. Stability and change in human characteristics. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Bloom, R. S. Testing cognitive ability and achievement. In N. L. Gage (Ed), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Blosser, G. H. Group intelligence test as screening devices in locating gifted and superior students in the ninth grade. Exceptional Children, 1963, 29, 282-86.

Bruch, C. B. A proposed rationale for the identification and development of the gifted disadvantaged. TAG Gifted Children Newsletter, 1970, 12(2), 40-49.

Bruch, C. B. Modifications of procedures for identification of the disadvantaged gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1971, 15, 267-272.

Bruch, C. B. Ideas regarding identification of gifted and talented students and the potentially gifted and talented in black school populations. Planning Committee, 1972.

Cárdenas, B., & Cárdenas, J. A. Chicano--Bright-eyed, bilingual, brown, and beautiful. Today's Education, 1973 (February), 49-51.

Christiansen, T. & Livermore, G. A comparison of Anglo-American and Spanish-American children on the WISC. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1970, 81, 9-14.

Cline, V. B., Needham, W. E., & Richards, J. M. Creativity tests and achievement in high school science. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1963, 47, 184-89.

DeAvila, E. A. Some cautionary notes on attempting to adapt IQ tests for use with minority children and a neopiagetian approach to intellectual assessment: Partial report of preliminary findings. Paper presented at the BABEL Conference on Testing, San Francisco, 1972.

De Hann, R. F., & Havighurst, R. J. Educating gifted children. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Dentler, R. A., & Mackler, B. Originality: Some social and personal determinants. Behavioral Science, 1964, 9, 1-7.

Dodd, B. N. A study of creative characteristics of Latin American male juvenile delinquents and Latin American male juvenile non-delinquents. Masters thesis. Unpublished manuscript, Texas College of Arts and Industries, 1964.

Dolbear, K. Precocious children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1912, 19, 461-91.

Doughty, E. Characteristic differences between pupils identified as gifted and non-gifted. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 21, 5908.

Fay, V., Oakland, T., et. al. Practical guidelines for testing young disadvantaged children. Austin, Tx.: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1971

Feldhusen, J. F., Condon, C. F., & Denny, T. Anxiety, divergent thinking and achievement. Journal or Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 40-45.

Fine, B. Stretching their minds. New York: Dutton & Co., Inc., 1964.

Freehill, M. Gifted children. New York: MacMillan, 1961.

Freeman, D. M. A note on interviewing Mexican Americans. Social Science Quarterly.

Frierson, E. C. The gifted. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 39(1), 25-37.

Gallagher, J. J. The gifted child in the elementary school. Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers, American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association, 1959.

Gallagher, J. J. Teaching the gifted child. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1961.

Gallagher, J. J., & Rogge, W. The gifted. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36(1), 1963-65.

Gallagher, J. J. Talent delayed--talent denied; the culturally different gifted child: A conference report. Arlington VA.: The Council for Exceptional Children, in press.

Garcia, A. B., & Zimmerman, B. J. The effect of examiner ethnicity and language on the performance of bilingual Mexican American first graders. Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 87, 3-11.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. Creativity and intelligence. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Ginsberg, E., & others. The Negro potential. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Gowan, J. C. Issues in the education of disadvantaged gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1968, 12, 115-119.

Gowan, J. C. Relation between creativity and giftedness. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1971, 15(4), 239-243.

Gowan, J. C., & Torrance, E. P. (Eds.) Educating the ablest: A book of readings in the education of gifted children. Itasca, Il.: Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Guilford, J. P. Intellectual factors. In M. J. Ascher & C. E. Bish (Eds.), Productive thinking in education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965.

Guilford, J. P. Intellect and the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1972, 16, 175-184 ff.

Guilford, J. P. & Hoepfner, R. Creative potential as related to measures of IQ and verbal comprehension. Indiana Journal of Psychology, 1966, 41(1), 7-16.

Jacobs, J. B. Bilingualism and creativity. Elementary Education, 1966, 43, 499-503.

Janssen, C. A study of bilingualism and creativity. Final report, American Personality and Guidance Association. Washington, D. C.; Texas Women's University, Denton, 1969.

Jenkins, M. The upper limit of ability among American Negroes. In J. L. French (Ed.), Educating the gifted, a book of readings. (Rev.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Jensen, A. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39(1), 1-124.

John, V. P. The intellectual development of slum children: Some preliminary findings. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963.

Karnes, M. B. & others. The efficiency of two organizational plans for underachieving intellectually gifted children. Exceptional Children, 1963, 29, 438-46.

Kleinfeld, J. S. Intellectual strengths in culturally different groups: An Eskimo illustration. Review of Educational Research, 1973, 43, 341-359.

Lesser, G. S., et. al. Mental abilities of children in different social and cultural groups. City University of New York, Hunter College Publications, 1964.

Lyon, H. C., Jr. The other minority: A preliminary report on USOE's effort to help our most promising children. U. S. Office of Education, 1972.

Manaster, G. J., & Havighurst, R. J. Cross-national research: Social-psychological methods and problems. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972.

Martinson, R. A. Educational programs for gifted pupils. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1961.

Martinson, R. A., & Lessinger, L. M. Problems in the identification of intellectually gifted pupils. Exceptional Children, 1960, 26, 227-242.

Martinson, R. A., & Seagoe, M. V. The abilities of young children. Washington, D. C.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1967.

McGuire, C. The prediction of talented behavior in the junior high school: Human Talent Research Project. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Texas, 1961.

Meeker, M. N. Identifying potential giftedness. Bulletin of the N.A.S.S.P., 1971, 55, 92-92.

Mercer, J. R. Sociocultural factors in the educational evaluation of Black and Chicano children. Paper presented at the 10th Annual Conference on Civil and Human Rights of Educators and Students, Washington, D. C., 1972.

Miles, C. C. Gifted children. In L. Carmicheal (Ed.), Manual of child psychology. New York: Wiley, 1954.

Nelson, J. F. The construction of a scale of teacher judgement of pupil creativity. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, 1963.

ORI (Operations Research, Inc.) Analytic studies of selected educational data. Technical Report No. 661, 1971.

Passow, H. A. The gifted and the disadvantaged. National Elementary Principal, 1972, 51(5), 24-31.

Pegnato, C. W., & Birch, J. W. Locating gifted children in junior high schools: A comparison of methods. Exceptional Children, 1959, 25, 300-304.

Ramirez, M. III. Value conflicts experienced by Mexican American students. El Grito, 1972.

Riles, W. Education of mentally gifted minors. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1971.

Ripple, R. E., & Mar, F. B. Caution in comparing creativity and IQ. Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 229-230.

Romano, O. I., V. The anthropology and sociology of the Mexican American: The distortion of Mexican American history. El Grito, 1968, 2(1), 13-26.

Romano, O. I., V. The historical and intellectual presence of Mexican Americans. El Grito, 1969, 2(2), 32-46.

Sanborn, M. P., Pulvino, C. J., & Wunderlin, R. F. Research reports: Superior students in Wisconsin high schools. The University of Wisconsin: Research and Guidance Laboratory for Superior Students, 1971.

Sanderlin, W. Teaching gifted children. Cranbury, N. J.: Barnes & Co., Inc., 1973.

Sheldon, W. D., & Manolakes, G. Comparison of the Stanford-Binet, revised form 1 and the California Test of Mental Maturity (S form). Journal of Educational Psychology, 1954, 45, 499-504.

Skager, R. W., & Fitz-Gibbon, C. Mentally gifted disadvantaged students: An investigation of methods of identification, including the use of "culture fair" tests, at the eighth grade level. Final report, April 1972, University of California at Los Angeles, Contract No. OEC-9-71-0039(057), U. S. Office of Education.

Skeels, H. M. Adult status of children with contrasting early life experiences: A follow-up study. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966, 31(3, Serial No. 105).

Smith, R. M. Creative thinking abilities of educable mentally handicapped children in the regular grades. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1967, 71, 571-75.

Southern Regional Project for Education of the Gifted. The gifted student: A manual for program improvement. Author, 1962.

Stallings, C. Gifted disadvantaged children. National Leadership Institute: Teacher Education/Early Childhood (Technical paper). The University of Connecticut, 1972.

Strang, R. Helping your gifted child. New York: Dutton & Co., Inc., 1960.

Taylor, C. W., & Holland, J. L. Development and application of tests of creativity. Review of Educational Research, 1962, 32, 91-102.

Terman, L. M. Genetic studies of genius. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1925-1959. 5 Volumes.

Tittle, B. Selection process at the Creative Learning Center. Report to the Kettering Foundation, 1973.

Torrance, E. P. Guiding creative talent. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962.

Torrance, E. P. Gifted children in the classroom. New York: MacMillan, 1965.

Torrance, E. P. Torrance tests of creative thinking: Norms-technical manual. Princeton: Personnel Press, Inc., 1966.

Torrance, E. P. Issues in the identification and encouragement of gifted disadvantaged children. The Association for the Gifted Newsletter, 1969.

Torrance, E. P. Are the Torrance tests of creative thinking biased against or in favor of disadvantaged groups? The Gifted Child Quarterly, 1971, 15, 75-80.

Torrance, E. P. An alternative to compensatory education. Educational Horizons, Summer 1972, 176-182.

Torrance, E. P., & Strom, R. D. (Eds.) Mental health and achievement: Increasing potential and reducing school drop out. New York: Wiley, 1970.

United States Office of Education. Education of the gifted and talented. Vol. I & II. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972. (Also as Committee print, 92nd Congress, 2nd Session, 1972.)

Vernon, P. E. Intelligence and cultural environment. London: Methuen & Co., 1969.

Wallach, M. A. Creativity. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Manual of child psychology. (3rd Ed.) New York: Wiley, 1970.

Wallach, M. A., & Kogan, N. Modes of thinking in young children: A study of the creativity-intelligence distinction. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1965.

Wallach, M. A., & Wing, C. W., Jr. The talented student. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969.

Walton, G. Identification of the intellectually gifted children in the public school kindergarten. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1961.

Wechsler, D. Wechsler intelligence scale for children manual. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1949.

Yamamoto, K. Role of creative thinking and intelligence in high school achievement. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 783-789.

Yamamoto, K. Effects of restriction of range and test unreliability on correlations between measures of intelligence and creative thinking. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 35(3), 300-305.

Zirkel, P. A. Spanish-speaking students and standardized tests. Urban Review, 1972, 5/6, 32-40.